

11391

2/

A
CALM REPLY,
TO
MR. JOSEPH BENSON'S
FARTHER DEFENCE
OF
THE METHODISTS.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

CALM REPLY

ALLIANCE AND UNION

STRENGTH AND PROGRESS

CALM REPLY

TO

MR. JUSTICE BENSON

IN HIS DEFENCE

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

THE M. J. O. M. S.

A
CALM REPLY,
TO THE
FALLACIOUS ARGUMENTS,
AND
VIRULENT INVECTIVES,
CONTAINED IN
Mr. Joseph Benson's
FARTHER DEFENCE
OF
THE METHODISTS.

By W. RUSSEL.

Some indeed preach Christ of Envy and Strife, and some of
good Will. PHILIPP. i. 15.

Follow Peace with them that call on the Lord out of a *pure Heart*.
Foolish and unlearned Questions avoid. 11. TIM. ii. 22, 23.

WOLVERHAMPTON:

PRINTED AND SOLD BY J. SMART;

Sold also by EVANS, *Pater-Noster Row, London*; TYMES and SMART,
Worcester; PEARSON, *Birmingham*; SANDFORD, *Stretwbury*; HARROP,
Manchester; THOMAS, *Ludlow*; ALLEN, *Hereford*; WILTON, *Tisbury*;
DYDE, *Tewksbury*; and AGG, *Exeter*.

MDCCXCIV.



THE METHODIST CHURCH
OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA
PUBLISHED BY THE
METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK

THE METHODIST CHURCH
OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA
PUBLISHED BY THE
METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK

THE METHODIST CHURCH
OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA
PUBLISHED BY THE
METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK

THE METHODIST CHURCH
OF THE UNITED STATES
OF AMERICA
PUBLISHED BY THE
METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK

CALM REPLY, &c.

SIR,

I SHALL begin this my second Address to you, with a few sententious Remarks from the Writings of *Solomon*: not that I can possibly suppose *You* unacquainted with them, but because I think them particularly applicable to the Manner in which our Controversy has been carried on; and containing such Instructions, as, *if duly regarded*, may be of Service to *both* of Us; for I trust that Neither of Us is so hardened in Folly as to come under the Character of those who are said to “despise Instruction.” Prov. i. 5. Such, at least, is the Opinion I have of myself; though it is not improbable but *you* may think me one of those who “harden their Necks against Reproof:” However, Sir, I hope to convince you of my *firm Belief* that “Reproofs of *Instruction* are the Way of Life;” and that “Faithful are the *Wounds* of a *Friend*, but “the Kisses of an Enemy are deceitful.” The *first* and last of your five Letters addressed to me, did each conclude with subscribing yourself my “*Friend*.” Therefore, after such an Assurance of your Regard for me, what Reason can I have to doubt your *friendly* Intentions in “chastising my *Insolence*?” (P. 87.) Now to be chastised, even by a Friend, cannot be very agreeable to any Person, for “no Chastening for the present seemeth joyous but grievous; nevertheless it afterwards yieldeth the peaceable Fruit of Righteousness, unto

"them which are exercised thereby." Heb. xii. 11. So we are told, in a Book for which I have *some Degree* of Veneration, and I myself hope to experience its Truth, that *your* Chastisement will produce in *me* the peaceable Fruits of Righteousness. There are two very great Evils threatened against the Man who refuseth Instruction, both which do I wish to avoid, viz. "Poverty and Shame," Prov. xiii. 18. whereas it is said on the *contrary*, that "He who regardeth Reproof shall be honoured," but "He that hateth Reproof is brutish." xii. 1. The same Writer, who has transmitted to us these judicious reflections, has also told us that "a Fool's wrath is *presently* known, but a prudent Man *covereth* Shame". Prov. xii. 16. And he further saith, "the Fool rageth, and is *confident*." Prov. xiv. 16. Now if Wrath, Rage, and Confidence, be the Characteristics of a Fool, then will I endeavour to shun the Appellation and assert my Right to a Portion (of what you seem disposed to deny me the Possession, that is) of Common Sense. (P. 70.) To more than a plain sound Understanding, I have never yet been vain enough to lay claim; although you are pleased to ascribe to me *Vanity of my Abilities* as "being puffed up," &c. (P. 65.) However, Sir, so far as I've now made a Claim, I hope my Conduct through Life will give me Credit with the World, to let it pass as a good one; and though the Proud (Benson) hath imagined and reported that against me which is not true, yet will I endeavour to "keep the Precepts of God with my whole Heart," (Psalm cxix, 69.) in defiance of all the *Calumnies* that have already issued, and may in future issue, from his slanderous Pen. That I, a young Minister of the Church of England, (almost Self-taught, though not Self-ordained, and but little skill'd in the Art of Controversial Writing nor deeply versed in Polemic Divinity) for having *dared* to communicate to the Public a few Pages against that Defence of the Methodists written by You, the great and learned Mr. Benson (the

avowed

avowed Champion of Methodism!) should thereby provoke your Indignation, is a thing not at all to be wondered at: but why it should "greatly tend to augment the Adherents to Methodism" as you intimate (P. 57.) or why "the Heads of Houses and Dignitaries of the Church should be displeased at my Interference in this Matter" (P. 53.) is what I can see no Reason for. I presume, Sir, that in this Land of Liberty every Man hath as much Right to *publish* his Sentiments (if he pleases) as to *speak* them, provided they are not subversive of National Peace and good Order. The very *contrary* of this was the Intent of my Hints. I wrote them with the View of stating wherein I thought your "Defence" to be indefensible, and endeavouring, as far as in my Power, to prevent the Simple, "who believeth every word" (Prov. xiv. 15.) from becoming the Dupe of Sophistry and wild Enthusiasm; hoping as a faithful Shepherd, to keep the Flock of Christ together, that they may not turn away their Ears from the Truth, nor be any more Children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the *Sleight* of Men. This Sir was the great and Primary Object of my writing "Hints to the Methodists, &c."

Perhaps the Effects of my Pamphlet have not been answerable to my Intentions and Wishes; and *possibly* the Cause I have defended, or at least *attempted* to defend, has been brought into Disrepute with the Ignorant and Undiscerning, owing to the Unskillfulness of Me, its Advocate. Particularly this may have been the Case since your "*Farther Defence*" has appeared, wherein you have attacked my Reasoning with that Artillery of Learning, Sophistry, and Sarcasm, of which you are allowed to possess so large a Train; and on which Account you are a formidable Opponent even to the *Literati*; much more to a Man of no greater Proficiency in Learning than what I have attain'd to. Therefore I may incur the Censure of many as a rash and *headstrong*

strong young man (you say indeed I have a *weak* head) for daring to ascend the Stage of Controversy, a second Time, against an Adversary so much superior to me in the Use of literary Weapons: And they may say that I ought to have regulated my Conduct by the Words of the wise Author of Ecclesiastes, "Neither may a Man contend with him that is "mightier than He." Chap. vi. 10.

Tamely to lie down vanquished, and to submit while there is a Chance for Victory, at least for *honourable* Terms of Capitulation, is the Conduct of a Coward: And I think Sir that Cowardice is a Temper of Mind which *no* Man of Virtue would wish to possess; for it is neither enjoined by the Dictates of Natural Reason, nor is it countenanced by Scripture;* unless the Meaning of those Writings is *wrested* to suit the Hypothesis of him who advances it; and *then* there is no Act however absurd, no Doctrine however erroneous, which may not, in some Measure, be justified by Passages deduced from thence. As a Proof, suppose now a Man has a Mind to *starve himself to Death*. He need not be at a Loss for Scripture to sanction the *Suicide*; [for the Apostle says "Neither, if we eat, are we the better: neither, if we eat "not, are we the worse;" 1. Cor. viii. 8. Therefore the Person may say, in Support of his Conduct, that if no Criminality is attached to Abstinence from Food (for if we eat not we are not *the worse*) of course he may fast as long as he pleases, even till he has *made fast*† the *Breath Doors of Life*] in plain Terms, till he cannot eat any more: and his Soul and Body then mutually agreeing to a Separation, the one

* The Righteous are *bold* as a Lion. Prov. xxviii. 1. Peter and John were Men of Boldness, and "spake the Word of God with *Boldness*," Acts xxviii. 31. So that Scripture does not teach Us to be Cowards.

† See Note at the End.

takes its Flight for Heaven (for of course it cannot go elsewhere as he is not "the worse" for having so destroyed himself) and the other is conveyed to a Place where it will soon be changed into its primeval Atoms, for "Dust thou art, and *"unto dust thou shalt return"*— §

On this Principle I can readily justify my Conduct in again appearing before the Public to combat with You, however inferior I may be to you in Argument. "Whosoever shall smite thee on thy right Cheek, turn to him the other also." So, if I have already given you *one* Opportunity to make me appear to great Disadvantage in the Judgment of many, *there* you see, Sir, is Scripture to sanction my giving you *another* Opportunity; and, in *my* mind, this is as fairly applied, as *many* Passages of holy Writ are by You to countenance the Tenets of Methodism.

§ By way of confirming what is above said, that *perverted* Scripture may be applied to suit any Purpose, no matter how wicked, even that of *Suicide*, I must not omit to insert here an Anecdote which I have heard related of the facetious and judicious South, the Author of several Volumes of Sermons. Conversing one Day with a Quaker, upon religious Matters, He said that the Doctrine of Quakerism was visionary and unfounded, or not according to Truth. *Obadiab* said it could be proved from *Scripture*. So it may, says South, for there is no Opinion, nor any Conduct, however criminal, which may not have some Parts of Scripture adduced in Support of it. *Prim* denied the Position. The Bible was produced. The Quaker was to select any Passage he should please to choose. He fixed upon this, "And *Judas* went out and hanged himself." Now Friend South (says the Quaker) what Passage canst thou bring in Support of *Judas's* Conduct? Says South immediately, "Go and do thou likewise." The Quaker was compelled to yield in opinion, though he did not conform in *Practice*; but whether or not South converted him from Quakerism we are not told.—Whenever you, Mr. Benson, shall be pleased to favour the world with any more of your *Quintine* Epistles (for five seems to be a favorite Number with you, *perhaps* in Allusion to some five *Apostles* of Methodism,—let me consider—*Wesley*, *Benson*, and some other three) if addressed to me I hope you will be *merciful* towards me respecting this Note, because it may be deviating from *Gravity*.

However, such Quotations answer one good Purpose for *You*; They tend to bias the Vulgar and Injudicious to your Opinion, and induce them to side with You in their Decisions upon the present Controversy; for the *Pious* but *Ignorant*, (such is their Veneration for the sacred Oracles!) commonly deem that Opinion the most valid which is most environed with Scriptural Quotations, and that Person the best Reasoner who can most readily quote them. I myself knew an instance of a Bigot of this kind, who would not believe the Diurnal or Annual Rotation of the Earth because the Psalmist has said, "he hath made the round* World so sure that

* These were his Words, for he quoted from the Psalms of the Liturgy, which Translation is more familiar to many Persons (even the godly) than that of the Bible. I do not learn any where that the Psalmist's Geographical Knowledge was such as to say any thing respecting the Globular Form, or Rotundity, of the World. The Word round in the Liturgy is evidently the Effect of their Knowledge who framed that Service. The Bible Translation runs thus "The World also is established that it cannot be moved." Ps. xciii. The Greek Words are these, *καὶ γὰρ ἐξερέωσε τὴν δικαμένην, ἥτις ἔσταλενθήσεθαι*. Now Sir I have no doubt of your ready Belief when I tell you that I am *not* a *profound* Grecian; but that little which I do know, gives me *some* Reason to believe that even the Bible Translation is not the *exact* Sense of the Sacred Penman. The Word which we have here rendered into *moved*, you know comes from *Σαλευμαι* which the Latinists interpret by *factus*, agitor, quassor, to be moved, agitated, or shapen. *Σαλευμαι* is the passive Verb, formed from *Σαλευω* *fluctuo*, to flow as a Wave. *Σαλευω* comes from *Σαλός*; and that from *Αλς* *Mars*, or, the Sea. Now might not the Psalmist (as he was reciting the Majesty and Strength of the Lord) have some Thoughts about the *Deluge*, (as a proof of God's Might) and, if so, then his Intentions doubtless were to signify *thus much*, that the Lord hath so established, so formed, so constructed, or rather made so *firm*, the Earth, that No One shall *deluge* it, or that the "Fountains of the Great Deep shall not be broken up" by any One.—What the Psalmist's Words may signify in the *Original* Language, I cannot say, for so far from being able to read Hebrew, I can scarce recollect the Difference betwixt an Aleph and a Tau; but I am inclined to give into this Opinion because the Psalmist, but a few Words intervening, expressly

"that it cannot be moved." Therefore, says he, "shall I
 "not rather believe God than Man, for the One may err,
 "the Other cannot." *Thus the Demonstration of true Philoso-*
phy must give Way to a weak Faith, and Fanatics who can
 quote the Scriptures (however wrongfully) are to be deemed
 oracular!—

Perhaps, Sir, the Methodists (and you amongst the Rest)
 may be too incredulous to believe the Truth of this Story, till
 I "specify both Time and Place," (P. 56) and *Person*. They
 may "suspend their Belief" if they please: I do not consider
 myself under any such Obligations as these. I here aver it as
 a Fact; and have mentioned it by Way of exposing that "*too*
superstitious" Attachment, of those who are more devout than
 judicious, to every thing that can be, in the most distant
 Manner, defended by any Passage or Passages of Holy Writ.
 Having thus far explained the Reason of my obtruding my-
 self *once more* on the attention of the Public, I now proceed
 to reply, in as *calm* a Manner as I am able, to such of your

expressly mentions "the Floods," &c. and this is corroborated by what is
 afterwards said in the civ. Psalm, 5. V. "Who laid the Foundations of
 "the Earth that it should not be removed *for ever*. He could not design to
 "signify hereby the *Eternity* of the World (as some in our Days have writ-
 "ten upon) but the *Termination of Time*; till which should happen, the Earth
 "should be no more covered with the Deep as with a Garment, for He (God)
 "hath set a *Bound* to the Waters that they may not pass over nor turn again
 "to cover the Earth."—This Portion of Criticism I here state merely as
 Conjecture. My Learning is not sufficient to enable me to speak with Con-
 fidence on this Point, notwithstanding you charge me with being "puffed up"
 with a Notion of my own great Abilities. I hope, Sir, this Note will serve
 to convince you that however "*gay* my Turn of Mind" (P. 30) may be,
 I have *some* Delight in searching the Scriptures; and likewise prove to the
 World, in what a peremptory, invidious, malevolent, and unauthorised Man-
 ner You decide upon Characters.—Since I am neither, so "*weak nor un-*
 "*learned*" as you have pronounced me to be.

Arguments as seem to me inconclusive and fallacious, and to support such of my own as were advanced, in my Hints, founded on, what appeared to me, then, and still *continue* to appear, founded on,—the firm Basis of Truth.—Here, Sir, I hope you will not deny me the same Privilege that you have taken yourself, viz: the Privilege of *not doubting* that *Truth* is on my Side; and I admit with You that “Truth “is great and *will* prevail;” nor “will it lastingly, suffer by “Discussion; although it may be injured for a Time by falling “into the Hands of insufficient Defenders.” That may happen to the Cause in which I am engaged, but I trust that God will not fail to raise up Others, who will be found “more adequate to the important Task.”—I admit, Sir, the full Force of those few Latin Words which (in P. 53) you apply against Me, “Non tali Auxilio &c.” Doubtless the Church of England “does not stand in need of *such* Defenders” as me, to assert her Cause. She has Men of the most splendid Talents, who are *well disposed* to fight her literary Battles, and *well-able* to give her Enemies the Chastisement which they deserve. But still I do not consider myself as *culpable* for having fought under her Banners *thus far*, and having thus *increased* a Contest that may be productive of permanent Peace. As a small Spark may, by meeting with proper Matter, excite such a Fire as to produce a great Light, so I hope that the *Spark struck* by Dr. Tatham, which has produced the *Flame* of Controversy between You and Me, will so invigorate and warm the Souls of some able Men in this Kingdom, that they will be impelled to exercise their (otherwise perhaps *latent*) Faculties, by such judicious and learned Explanations relative to Theology and Church Government, that they will be as “Lights unto our Paths,” and we shall no longer have our People deluded into By-ways by mistaking the *Ignis fatuus* of Bensonian Sophistry, for the *true Light* of incontrovertible Argument.—

Now

Now do not imagine, Sir, that I mean to be so obstinately wedded to Error as to *attempt* the Vindication of such Parts of my Pamphlet as you have *fairly* refuted: consequently I am induced to confess that had I been less "hasty" in the Publication of it, it might have been made *much* less liable to the Objections, and petty Cavils, of so *artful* and *malicious* an Opponent as *You* are. There are some Inconsistencies in it which had certainly been expunged if I had been more deliberate; such as that which you have so well (and deservedly) satirized in your 12th Page, as "*a monstrous Production, an Excrescence, &c.*" and there are also some other Parts of my Hints that I cannot pretend to justify, though they are far from authorizing such exaggerated Comments as *You*, in the Rancour of your Heart, and "Gall of Bitterness," have been pleased to put upon them.

Whatever degree of Credibility your Assertions may have amongst those who are the zealous Adherents of Methodism (who very probably may shew as much Deference and Veneration for your Sentiments, as was manifested by the Athenians towards the Answers which proceeded from the Delphian Oracle) is not within the reach of my Means of Enquiry; but those who will not suffer their Reason to be superseded by Fanaticism, will not give to your Declarations that implicit Credence which they receive from those Votaries who have "their Names written in the Book of *Westleyan Saints.*" To me, at least, the very *first Line* of your "Farther Defence" seems justly questionable. You say, "Although I do not *love* Controversy on any Subject, &c."—Possibly, Sir! you may not. I cannot positively say you do *love* it, because I cannot look into your Heart. The Truth of that Assertion can only be ascertained by that Omniscient Being who does not judge from outward Appearances and verbal Assurances, but "looketh on the Heart," and seeth the hidden Springs of it, for he "understandeth all the Imaginations

"tions of the *Thoughts*:" But if Man may be allowed to form an Estimate of the inward Inclinations, the real Motives and Propensities of his Fellow-Creatures, by an Analysis of their Words and Actions, then certainly I am authorised to *discredit* this Line which declares your *Aversion* to Controversy. In your 64th Page (when arguing to prove *Bishops* and *Elders* the *same* Persons) you make use of these Words, "And this Point, Sir, I am ready to dispute with You *whenever* you please." Now is it *probable* that a Man should thus give a Challenge declaring his Readiness *at all times* for disputatious Argument, and yet *not* love Controversy?—Besides this Declaration (which tends, *in itself*, to invalidate your Testimony) we have the corroborative Circumstances of your previous Conduct; unless I am much mistaken in what I have heard, and seen with my own Eyes upon Paper, viz. Books "lately published by J. Benson." Have you never been engaged in any literary Dispute previous to your Remarks on Dr. Tatham's Sermon, and since then with the Person now proposing this Question to you? Have you not been the Author and Editor of Books *expressly* controversial? Yes, Sir, you have. Now is it likely that a Man would undertake those Labours if he did *not* love Controversy? Was you unavoidably compelled to it? Were there none others that would have eased you of those unpleasant Offices? Or were there none, amongst these *Thousands* whom you state, as able to cope with me, (P. 58) whom you thought of sufficient Abilities for such arduous and ungrateful Employments? Or, perhaps, you thought that few were *so well* qualified for them as yourself: and if so, your Thoughts were well-founded in *some* Respects, for there are few who will scruple less than yourself to adopt any Arts (however unfair) for defeating an Antagonist; representing his *strong* Arguments in the most disadvantageous Point of View by means of sophistical Comments and Explanations, and exposing his *weak* ones, with a most pointed, envenomed, and malicious strain

strain of Raillery. Few there are, who possess the "Ridiculum Acri," the Sarcastic with the Severe, in a greater Measure than what you do; and as *most* Men are *as* fond of displaying their Perfections as they are anxious to conceal their Defects, I think we may justly infer that the same Principle operates *upon You*, and that you are not willing the World should judge of *You only* as a pious Pastor "rightly dividing the Word of Truth" and "speaking a Word in Season unto Him that is weary" with the Burthen of *his* Sins, but remain unacquainted with your superior Qualifications as an able Disputant, being ready to give an Answer to every Man, and to confute "Gainfayers." i. e. such as shall dare to gainsay or oppose, by speaking or writing against those Tenets, of that "pure and unadulterated Gospel of Jesus-Christ," (P. 17. 1st. Defence) which you profess to teach to others:—Tenets, which, however true under certain Limitations, have been carried to a Degree of Extent never authorized by the Spirit or Tenor of the Sacred Writings; and therefore stood in need of *such* Abilities as Yours to gloss them over with such specious Arguments that they may appear, to the Ignorant and Indiscriminating, as the Way of Truth in which all Men ought to walk, and out of which whoever should deviate must necessarily therefore be in Error, and treading in the "broad Way that leadeth to Destruction."

In P. 19. you propose this Question to me, "can he" (an ungodly Man) "teach what he does not *know*?" "Here, Sir, is as much "*pitiful shuffling*," (P. 21) as much mean Subterfuge and evasive Reserve, as can be found in my Assertion respecting the Power of Bishops to nominate *Men* to teach Godliness. If you had put the Question fairly, according to the *Drift* of your Reasoning, it should have been thus, "Can an ungodly Man teach what he does not *know*, "by *Self-experience*?" If it had been thus stated, I had immediately

mediately replied that He can. He can Teach it from the Writings of *others* who have *experimentally* known the Efficacy of the Means they prescribe for the Cure of our *Spiritual Maladies*, and on whose Veracity the (ungodly) Teacher places his Confidence, although he is not certain of the Virtues of those Means from *Self-Experience*.—As you have thought proper to illustrate Metaphysical Arguments with *Physical* Comparisons, I must here oppose you with the same Sort of Weapons: and I rather am inclin'd to think that I shall *here* be so much Superior to you that it will seem as if I fought with an Amputation-Knife, and you with a Lancet or Bistoury.—The vital Juice will flow in greater Abundance from your Wounds than from mine, and you will be glad to apply to me to spare my Strokes and lend you a *Syptic*, or you will find the Hemorrhage prove fatal. But Words apart, Sir, and now to the Trial!—Then, Is the Physician who gives Lectures on Medicine not to mention or rather *can* he not mention, to his Pupils any Remedies for Diseases, of the Virtues of which he himself has not an actual *Self-knowledge*? or, when a Medical Practitioner is called in to a Patient labouring under some Disease that he himself never felt, must he neglect to prescribe for him till he has caught the Disease and first tried some Remedy upon His own Person? Must the Patient be suffered to languish for Want of Help, till the Doctor has attained the experimental Knowledge of a Remedy tried upon *his own* Body? Cannot a Physician *honestly* prescribe *Mercury* for the Cure of any Disorder, where he may deem it a good Remedy, without having first experienced its Efficacy upon *himself*, in all those several Complaints (*Morbus Gallicus*, &c.) where Mercury has been found useful by others who have communicated their Discoveries *for the Benefit of the Public*? of what Use then, Sir, are the Writings of *Astruc*, *Boerhaave*, and others now dead, or of that ingenious System of Absorption taught us by Mr. Clare?

They

They are mere dead Letters. Every Physician (according to Mr. Benson) must be like the Prodigal in the Gospel; that is, he must first have "devoured his Living amongst Harlots," before he can be *qualified* to undertake the Cure of what our advertizing Quacks denominate a *certain secret Disorder*. Or, to carry the Matter a little farther by Physical Metaphors, Must a Medical Man have suffered the repeated Rigors of an Intermittent, the Shiverings and Burnings of an Ague, before he can be qualified to *prescribe* Bark, or any other Medicine of known Virtue to remove the Disease? Must he take a Journey amongst the *Caledonian* or *Cambrian* Mountains, in order to catch a Disease frequently to be met with in those Regions, before he can venture to recommend Sulphur as a *certain means* to eradicate so troublesome a Malady? I think, Sir, that your Language is, *to the full*, as equivocal as mine, and therefore as exceptionable and deserving of Censure: indeed more so, as you, a learned and acute Logician, practice that which you condemn in me, an unlearned Curate, who, as you imply, am unacquainted with Syllogisms, Premises, and Conclusions, having never "learned Logic at the Universities." (P. 21.) "Can a Man teach what he does not know?" How Jesuitical! You ought to have given a determinate sense to the Word *teach*, whether by *Oral* or *written* Means, whether as a *Preacher*, or as an *Author*. But in neither Case can a Man teach what he does not "*know*." But, Sir, surely you will admit there is a Possibility of Theological Knowledge being attained by two Ways, *Mediately* by others and *Immediately* by ourselves, or by that Portion of Illumination and Light in the Understanding which the Lord shall vouchsafe to bestow upon Us, by the gracious Operations of that sanctifying Spirit which helpeth our Infirmities, and leadeth us into the Knowledge of all Truth. Thus, Sir, you see, I do not admit your Position

(P. 18.) that Christ can *only* be learned by *immediate Supernatural* Illumination.

In P. 18. a few Lines only before the Question which I have now answered (and I hope it has been done in such a manner as to satisfy, or at least to *convince*, You) you say "Indeed an Ungodly Man *cannot* preach it, (meaning the " Gospel) at least not properly, for he does not know it."—To your "at least not properly," I here declare my hearty Assent; but to your inexceptive *cannot*, I cannot agree: for a Man may teach and preach (as the Echo or Trumpet of other Men) that Doctrine of which he has not a due Conviction by his own happy Experience, but takes it *upon Trust*, relying on the Integrity of others who declare that they *have* felt it, and proved it to be "a Doctrine according unto Godliness;" as the young Professor of the healing Art prescribes, for a Disease he never saw, such Remedies as he never tried himself, but finds them recommended by others who *have* tried them, and found them successful.

To your Question, P. 22. (where you ask, How I prove that a Bishop can send out Ungodly Men to teach Godliness, whether I find it "among the Records of Heaven, "or those of Hell?") I shall not deem it necessary to give any other answer than this—That I know not whether there are any Records kept *in* Hell. I do not recollect having met with such Information in the *Bible*. This indeed is not to be wondered at, if your Assertion be true where you said (P. 30.) that you suppose "Searching the Scriptures would not be a very "pleasant Work to a Person of *my* gay turn of Mind, and therefore selected a few Texts for my Choice, to *save me the* "Trouble." A Temper, so obliging as yours certainly ought not to be passed over *unnoticed*; and therefore, Sir, be pleased to imagine me, *in your Presence*, uttering any of such Sentiments as usually flow from a Man *duly* Impressed with the Sense of a *Favour conferred*. But however sensible I may be of this
your

your Kindness towards me, I must say, it was rather unfortunate for You that your " Friend just come from Worcesterhire" (P. 11.) (who told you there *was* such a Person as W. Ruffel, Curate of Pershore) did not give you some Information respecting his Conduct and Disposition; for then you would not have been so much " off your Guard" (P. 51.) as *positively* to denominate him of a *gay* turn of Mind.—So far, Sir, from a Temper of that Kind, that his Gravity has induced the Gay and Sprightly to suppose him *A Methodist*, and often hath he wished that the Planet Saturn had less Influence upon his Temperament; for you well know that Horace spake like a Man who knew the Human Heart when he said

Oderunt hilarem tristes, tristemque jocos;

Sedatum celeres; agilem gnavumque remissi.

As to searching the Scriptures being irksome or unpleasant to me, it is one of the greatest Pleasures of my solitary Hours. I can say, without Dissimulation, Sir, that " I delight in the Law of the Lord after the inward Man" (however prophane *you* may suppose me) I have a Respect unto his Statutes, and in that Law do I frequently meditate Day and Night; but was I to say that I give myself *so wholly* to them as to think or speak of nothing else, it would be asserting what my Conduct would in the one instance, manifestly disprove; and what, in the other, I never mean, nor wish, to put in practice: for though, with You Methodists I am " well assured of a *future* State" (P. 93) and consider myself formed for a nobler Inheritance than a mere Earthly Abode of three or four Score Years, for " We have here no continuing City but " seek one to come; This Mortal must put on Immortality; " We look for a Saviour who shall change our vile Body that " it may be fashioned like unto his glorious Body" and " we " hope to be changed into the same Image *from* Glory to " Glory;" notwithstanding these sublime Considerations, I

say that so long as our Earthly Tabernacle shall stand, and we shall be clothed in the Veil of Flesh, so long the Wants of the Flesh *will* press upon Us and make our spiritual Desires, our Breathings after Holiness, bend to their Grati-
fications; so that it is *Impossible* for Men to be as Spiritual as Angels. It's true, that St. Paul says, "Whether we *eat* "or *drink*, or *whatever* we do, we must do all to the Glory "of God!" So we ought, and so we may! but then this may be done without every Minute of Life being spent in a *serious* Reflection upon some Passage in God's Law. If such *unvaried* Seriousness should be the only Way to lay Claim to God's Promises, the Lord have Mercy on the whole World, and speedily *teach them better* than they now know, or they perish Everlastingly, and almost Universally! Though his Arm is not straitened that it cannot help, but his Mercy can save to the Uttermost, yet *this* Condition of Salvation would be an Exercise for the *utmost* Extent of Divine Mercy, as Mankind would be altogether gone astray, there would be None found walking in the Way of Life. I hope, Sir, that the Reasoning and *Language* in these two Pages, are sufficient to convince you (if you have not been *before* convinced) that I am much more conversant in the Scriptures than you supposed and *pronounced* me to be, and that I am not one of those to whom "the Preaching of the Cross is "Foolishness." Now from those matchless Treasures of Wisdom, I have not any where learnt that there are *Records* kept in Hell. St. Luke tells us of Names being written in *Heaven*. St. Paul, writing to the Philippians, alludes to "Names written in the Book of Life," and St. John, in the Apocalypse, says, that "they who worship the Beast are such "that have not their Names written in the Book of Life;" which Omission I suppose, precludes the Necessity of any Records being kept *in Hell*: if any are kept there I am obliged to confess myself really ignorant of them. However,
Sir,

Sir, if you have been favored, either by Illumination, by Cabalistic Learning, or by any other Means, with a Knowledge of the infernal Archives, you will do the World a Kindness, and particularly oblige me, if you will *add* to the List of Books publish'd by J. Benson, an History of the Devil; containing also a circumstantial Account of all the *Records* kept in the Archives of his Plutonic Majesty. There surely *must* be such Writings in Existence, or a man of *your* Gravity and Caution would not have ventured to ask me in such decided Terms whether I could find the Charter among the Records of Heaven, or *those of Hell*?

When, in P. 7 of my Hints, I made Use of the *reserved* Expression "lest as his Life *might* give the Lie to his Doctrine," my Sentiments were expressed exactly as I meant them to be, and is *such* Phraseology that I am *able* to defend against your *captious Criticism*, in your Comments upon it, (P. 23.) Such frivolous Censures as you *there* pass upon me, I am convinced, do rather serve to disgrace you than to strengthen your Cause, even in the Minds of your impartial Friends. By impartial Friends, I mean, Sir, such as do not suffer their Attachments to *overbalance* their Judgments.—[Trifling as this Definition may seem, I am *obliged* to give it, when contending with *such an Adversary* as *You* are; for, instead of your Charity teaching you to "hide my Sins" or *Defects*, you take every possible Opportunity to bring the most trifling Blemish into View, and with a malicious Asperity of Language strive to magnify its Deformity. If I had not *thus* obviated the Possibility of Cavil, I have no doubt but that, in your Rejoinder (for doubtless the World will be favoured with it *soon*) you would have taxed me with "asserting a Paradox" (P. 41.) and Solecism, that an *impartial* Friend is Nonsense, Friendship and Partiality being Words necessarily connected in Idea. But, to go on with my Reply.] You ask "What! Is it a Matter of Doubt
" whether

“whether it would or not?” Give me leave Sir to answer a Question by a Question, Is it *certain* that it would? I think you will hardly be rash enough to answer in the Affirmative. Pray! Sir, is there no Possibility of a Man who is admitted to Orders in a State of *Ungodliness* (according to your *Essentials* of the Ministerial Character, P. 17.) being afterwards convinced of the Error of his Ways, and being converted and regenerated? Is *Ordination* then such a Restraint upon the Operations of Divine Grace that it is *impossible* for the Seeds of Holiness to take Root *after* the “Laying on of Hands;” but, that He who is unholy *at the Time* will be unholy ever afterwards, and He that is filthy will be filthy still? Are all the Instructions that he may give (if only *officially*) to others, to be wholly lost upon himself? Is he *for ever* to be like the deaf Adder, and to shut his Ears against the Voice of Wisdom? Is it impossible for his *own* Principles to be renovated, whilst He preaches the Word of Reconciliation to others? Surely the Land, that *once* bore nothing but Briers and Thistles, may, when the Spiritual Husbandman is pleased to put his Plough into the Soil to root them up, and afterwards waters it with the Streams of Mercy and Consolation, be made capable of bearing good Fruit, and thereby contribute to “feed the Hungry.” If I may be *permitted* to tell you what I know of this Matter from *Self-experience*, which is a kind of Knowledge that seems to have great Weight in your Mind, it is briefly this,—That I have so felt the Force of Sermons which have been *preached* (or, as You say, *read*) by me to others, that while I have endeavoured to convince my *Hearers* of Sin, the Preacher himself has stood *Self-convicted*.—The Word has been like the Trumpets of Rams Horns with which the Walls of *Jericho* were blown down; (see Joshua vi. 5.) it has caused the strong Holds of *Iniquity* to fall, and the Loftiness of Man has been laid low: and when I *solemnly* assure you of this I hope you will not be

so destitute of Charity as to deem me *no* better a Christian *now* than when I took Orders and was made a Deacon. As to the Purity of the Motives which *induced* me to take Orders, a *Declaration* of them ought not to (and certainly would not) have been introduced here, *if* you had not forgotten the Commands, which say, "Judge not that ye be not judged; condemn not that ye be not condemned:" But as you have thus disregarded the Counsel of the Most High, and sat in Judgment upon *my* Principles, declaring me to be unfit for the Pastoral Office both as to *Qualifications* and *Vocation*, it behoves me to say a few Words on *that* Point, in order to remove Aspersions which are as malevolent as they are unfounded; as uncharitable as they are unauthorized.—Whatever Dependence some Persons may place on the Truth of your Assertions, which in many Instances are as peremptory* as *any* of mine, I cannot determine; but I trust that my Readers will not question my Veracity when I thus publicly assure *You*, that I think, my Intentions when admitted to the Sacred Office, were at least *as pure* as Yours were when you first obeyed the Call to be an *Itinerant* Preacher of the Gospel; and my "own Heart will witness that I *did* "speak the Truth, when I solemnly affirmed before the "Bishop" (P. 65) that *I trusted I was moved by the Holy-Ghost to take upon me that Office and Ministry*. My Views indeed were more confined and limited than yours *must* have been; but, I hope, not less upright nor less acceptable to God. To be instrumental to convey to my Fellow-Creatures the Knowledge of Christ crucified, and the Doctrines consequent thereupon, *in an orderly Way*, was the object that I found most strongly influence me both *before* and *at* the

* Of this I shall give you sufficient Proof "before I have done with "You;" (P. 21.) and not only prove them *peremptory*, but that they "are as "ridiculous as they are unfounded." (P. 56.)

Time of Ordination, and which does *still* retain its Ascendency over every other Consideration. But, notwithstanding this Rectitude of Intention, the natural Man *within me* has never yet been so *wholly* subdued, but that I have *sometimes* (indeed too often) found the same Spiritual Conflicts that St. Paul did; who declares that he found "another Law in his Members warring against the Law of his Mind, and bringing him into Captivity to the Law of Sin which was in his Members." Rom. vii. 23. Now if the great Apostle of the Gentiles served the Law of God in his Mind, but was sometimes subject to the Law of Sin in the Flesh, surely *A* great Apostle of the Methodists will "not be extreme to mark what is done amiss" by the inferior Ministers of Christ's Church established in this Realm! Or, if he should determine to be acrimonious in his Censures, "writing bitter Things against Them" (Job xiii. 26.) and declaring them to be unfit for the Pastoral Office because they are *not perfect*, and may *casually* deviate from the Spirit of Meekness and Gravity, yet, let him be honest enough to declare also that even St. Paul was not fit for an Apostleship, because he was not wholly free from Sin, or as blameless and "*irreproachable*" as the Methodist Teachers are *said* to be, (P. 36. 1st. Defence) but *sometimes* found a Law in his Members warring against the Law of his Mind. Let him say that the Piety of *Peter* ought to have been "*suspected*" and called in Question, because he had so far forgotten the "*Meekness of Wisdom*" as to smite off, with his Sword, the Ear of Malchus: Let him declare that *David* never was, nor could be, the Man after God's own Heart, because, in some Acts of his Life, he was guilty of very heinous Transgressions of God's Law: Let him say that the returning Prodigal ought not to have been acknowledged as his Son by the Father, nor to have had the fatted Calf killed for him, because he had, *for a Time*, left his Father's House and lived riotously; because

because he had once been unmindful of his Father's Will, and did not look after his Employments in Husbandry, nor tend his Flock of Sheep as he ought to have done: and *lastly*, let him *positively* assert, that although the "Law made Men Priests" which had Infirmary," Heb. vii. 28. yet that, under the Gospel, None are "*called of God*" (P. 64.) to the Pastoral Office but such as are free from *all* Infirmary (even *Weakness of Head*) and who are as pure as Angels—But I have digressed so long that I have *almost* forgotten the Subject I was arguing.—Now, Sir, if it is *possible* for a bad Man to become a better Christian after he has entered into the Ministry, then are my Sentiments judiciously expressed (so much, that "I meant precisely what I said" (P. 53.) and said precisely what I meant to say) nor can all the Sophistry of Mr. Benson disprove that Assertion. I said lest as his Life *might* give the Lie to his Doctrine, (and, if it should, then) it *would* weaken the Efficacy of his Labours amongst those who are more influenced by Example than Precept; (see P. 23) for I admit with you that Example is universally more prevalent than Precept; though *good* Precept ought to weigh more than *evil* Example. So long as God shall continue to us the Power of *discerning* Good from Evil we ought "to refuse the Evil, and choose the Good," Isaiah vii. 15. nor should we be seduced from our Duty by the evil Example of any Individual; nor even will it justify Us, if we follow a *Multitude* to do Evil; for though "Hand join in Hand to commit Iniquity," the Lord has declared that the Wicked shall *not* go unpunished." Prov. xi. 21.

So far, Sir, I think you cannot triumph in any great Advantage over me, but must rather give Place. I took my Post on difficult Ground, and yet have sustained it against your furious Attacks: or rather I should call them your *paltry* Attacks; your Attacks that *disgrace* you; for they are a "Strife of Words, whereof," as the Apostle tells Us, "com-

“eth Envy, Contention, Railings, and evil Surmifings.”
 1. Tim. vi. 4. You have in this Place convinced me that your Disposition is *captious* in the Extreme; and that, while you earnestly “contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints,” (however *true* or *erroneous* may be your Notions of that Faith) you will not omit to contend for unprofitable and vain Matters “which minister Questions, rather than godly “Edifying.” 1. Tim. i. 4. From the manner in which you have represented (or rather misrepresented) my Words in your 23d Page, I am rather disposed to believe, that, had I said a bad Man’s life *would* (when he became a Minister) give the Lie to his Doctrine, instead of *might* give &c. You would then have called me to account for speaking in so peremptory and decided a Tone. I am almost certain you would have attacked me on this Point if you could any way have introduced it without weakening the general Drift of your Arguments. I think, such Conduct as this is *fairly* giving *Occasion* (and Cause) to your Adversary to speak *reproachfully* against you. How many *little* Defects have you *attempted** to discover in the Grammatical Construction of my Language; *Such* Observations, I should have thought *beneath* your Notice; but a Man in a *bad Cause*, like one who is in Danger of being drowned, will catch at any Twig, however small, which affords the *least* Hope of rescuing him from an untimely Death. Such trifling Remarks could answer no other Use than to put me, your Adversary, in a disadvantageous Point of View before your Readers. However as it may tend to produce this one good Effect (*bad* indeed in *Principle*, but *good* so far as it concerns your Cause) *via*; to

* I say emphatically *attempted*, for in most of those your Criticisms, you only discover your Ignorance, or Baseness, or *both*. To one of your Charges I plead Guilty, that in P. 79. where you advert to my Expression “*accuse with* instead of *accuse of*.”

give Weight to the Rest of your Sentiments, by making Men, (Men of *shallow* Judgments), believe your Opponent to be more inferior to You than he *really* is (though he is conscious of great Inferiority to you in *Learning*, that is to say in much Reading) so it is a Point of which he deems it prudent and requisite to avail himself by making Use of the "Re-tort courteous," in order that such sort of Readers may not "think more highly of you than they ought to think," Rom. xii. 3. but be convinced that the greatest may have their Failings, and the most perfect their Blemishes, as well as the most Learned their Moments of Ignorance or Oversight: however I shall reserve *your* Grammatical Errors till the Reply is finished, and then, having concentrated them, shall present my Readers with them in the same Order as they stand in your Book.

In attempting to refute my Assertion that the *People* were in fault if bad Men obtain Orders, as the *Si quis** is a Public Warning of such Intentions, *You* say, by Way of exculpating *them* (doubtless not without a View of gaining them over to your Side *by that Means*, for you know "a Man that flattereth his Neighbour spreadeth a Net for his Feet" Prov. xxix. 5. that is, he useth the most likely Means of entangling his Judgment, and inducing the Person to fall in with his Opinion; and therefore you made Use of these "flattering Words" which follow) "What have the *People* to do with it? Do they choose their own Ministers, or nominate in general the Persons they wish to be ordained to serve them; Are they consulted? Or is their Consent more or less asked? No! By no means." (P. 26) Now, Sir, you will be pleased to recollect that this is simply and no more than the *Ipsè dixit* or "bare assertion" (P. 21.) of Mr. Joseph Benson: therefore, Sir, you must "*suffer*" me to give

* See Note

you a flat Contradiction (not the Lie, Sir) and to say they *are* consulted; and which I shall now *prove* to You, if your System of Logic should admit that a Demonstration is a Proof.

Now, the *Si quis* being addressed to them publicly and universally, *does* consult their Opinion: and they are at Liberty to assent or *dissent* to the Candidates Admission, founding their Objections (should they have any) on such *substantial* Causes as respect the virtuous Conduct of his Morals. His *literary* Attainments are not to be the Object of *their* Investigation, but that is entrusted to such Persons as may *fairly* be adjudged *more competent* to give a right Decision. Thus then if the People take Care that their *Priests*, (or *Ministers* as you call them) are not *bad* Men, the Bishop will most probably take Care that they are not *ignorant* Men: and if the *Ministers* (a Term which I shall often make Use of by way of *obliging* You, that we may not seem to differ in *every Thing*; I say if the *Priests* or *Ministers*) are *neither bad Men nor ignorant*, what Right have the People to object to them? None at all. As to choosing their own *Ministers*, there is a manifest Inconvenience in it, and an evident Impropriety upon your own Principles, as being *frequently* destructive of that godly Peace and Union of Affection, which ought to subsist betwixt Christians. By Way of proving this Assertion let us *suppose* a Case.—You have your Friend a *Minister*; I have mine.—Each of us naturally wishes to have his Pastoral Friend for a Neighbour. A Contest takes Place, which of us shall succeed in this Desire; and I think it very probable that he who shall be defeated in his Wish will not be very affectionate (*for a Time*) towards his successful Competitor, nor feel so much Pleasure and Profit, as he ought to find, under the Instructions of that Man who was the Means of preventing his Friend from being in the same Place. Thus, Sir, this Plan of Ministerial Appointment by popular Election is productive of

of an Evil to the Church ; for as it tends to alienate their Affections, it must (according to *your* Definition of Schism, P. 45.) cause Persons to become Schismatics.—That such Differences *will* take Place by this Mode of appointing Pastors, the Proof does not rest upon mere *Conjecture* from an Analysis of the Human Heart discovering its *Propensities*, but can be supported from that best of all Proofs—reiterated Facts. Experience ! manifold Experience ! has taught the Inhabitants of *several* Places in this Kingdom (and may teach *You*, Sir, if you will but investigate the Business with Candour and diligent Enquiry) that where the Nomination to a Benefice has been vested in Feoffees, or in Corporations, &c. there the Entrance of almost every successive Minister has served as a fresh Cause to excite those Jealousies and Animosities which would *not* have arisen, had the Appointment of him depended upon some Public Patron not connected with the Place. As to the People absolutely nominating the Person they wish to *have ordained* to serve them, there is an Inconsistency and an Absurdity in it, *whether* we consider it according to the Plan of *our* Church Government *or* that System adopted by the *Methodists*.

Indeed if every Minister was to be stationary for *Life* amongst those very People who nominate him, and before whom he first utters the sacred Messages to call *Sinners* to Conversion, then would I confess that the *Vox Populi* ought to have great Weight in the Case, but as neither Rectors nor Vicars, much less *Curates*, in our Church, nor yet the *irreproachable* Teachers in your Societies, are irrevocably and unalterably fixed to one Spot for Life, so it is by no Means requisite that the express Nomination and sole Choice of the Person to be ordained should proceed from the People whom he is to serve : though they have *virtually* a *Share* in the Nomination, as he cannot be ordained in our Church without their *tacit* Consent, and they have the Power of counter-acting the

the Nomination from the Incumbent, if they can adduce such Charges as may justify the Rejection.

I hope and think that the Reasoning here stated upon this Subject is sufficiently clear and convincing to *confirm* what I before asserted, and consequently to serve as a Refutation of your Objections:—if I was to follow your Example I should say your *weak* Objections, but that would not be deemed very becoming from a young Man who neither knows Logic nor Grammar (if you say true) towards a Person of such *profound* Erudition as is the great, the tremendous, Mr. Benson:—A Man who writes in such a continued Strain of Sarcasm, that, one may from thence suppose, he *imagines* his Words are “like the Piercings of a Sword,” Prov. xii. 18. “Yea, sharper than a two-edged Sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of Soul and Spirit, and of the Joints and Marrow.” Heb. iv. 12.

This leads me to swerve from my Plan of replying to You in the regular numerical Order of your Pages, as I at *first* intended. Therefore I now go to P. 70. where I am compared to “Asahel pursuing Abner;” (running headlong into Danger without Armour against an armed Enemy) You there promise me a little Mercy; You say, “I will not *kill* you quite: at least not at *this Time*. But if your Rashness and mistaken Zeal carry You much further I will not be answerable for the Consequences.” Really, Sir, I do not know exactly how the Law of our Country stands respecting *Threats*, but I think you have said enough already to make you *answerable*. Here is a Menace against my Life; and if I have any Regard for personal Safety, I must do *that* against You, which is commonly termed *Swearing the Peace*. Mr. Benson, the worst that I threatened against You was only a kind of *manual* Answer often made use of in reply to impertinent Language, or, in plain English, I threatened to *knock you down* if you had in *Person* given me the *Lie*; for

for which improper and absurd Passage, *so inconsiderately* printed in my Hints, I have undergone such a Portion of Invective from *your Pen*, as plainly shews you to be *not* at all *sparing* of your Censures wherever you have *the least* Opportunity of applying them: But You have carried your Resentment to a much higher Pitch than *I* did: You have even shewn such a vindictive Spirit as to declare your design to *kill* me, if my Rashness should carry me much further: so then, if, at any future Time, I should forget to set a Watch before my Mouth and to guard the Door of my Lips; or should ever put Pen to Paper and write any thing against—that holy Body of People—the Methodists; the Consequence will be (O! how it makes me shudder to *think* of it!) that there will be a Termination to the Existence of the once Curate of Pershore. No other Person than Mr. Benson “*a Leader in a Party*” of the Methodists has promised to *kill* him if he should be any longer *zealous* for the Interest of that Church whereof he is a Priest or Minister. What a *truly pious* People must the *Methodists* be! How must they hunger and thirst after Righteousness, and study to do that which is right in the Eyes of the Lord! How patiently do they suffer Reproach! For the Leader in a Party, and of Course we may expect the inferior Teachers and the People will follow his Example (for they are God’s *Sheep*, and, we know, it is one Characteristic of those harmless Animals, that if the Leader of the *Flock* should be disposed to eat a little of their Neighbours Grass that *their* Wants may be made up out of *his* Abundance, or if *he* should be disposed to jump off a Bridge into the River, though he *hazards* his Destruction, the Rest of, this *placidum Pecus*, this simple peaceful Race will generally follow) I say the Leader in a Party of these holy Men has threatened to *kill* a Curate, if he should not hold his Peace, and refrain himself from speaking cruelly and despitefully against God’s *elect* and *chosen* People. Certainly this
cannot

cannot be " an Assembly of *treacherous Men*," Jerem. ix. 2. but an " Assembly of *Saints*;" Ps. lxxxix, 7. their Words are so holy, their Tempers so mild and forgiving!

However, Sir, I shall now cease from pursuing *this* Vein of Irony any longer, and come to a more serious Discussion of your Sentiments; for though perhaps I cannot ironize so well as you can, I do not hold myself *so much* your Inferior in cool Reasoning. Now to suppose from these Words that you meant to imbrue your Hands in my Blood, would really be Weakness. The Disparity in our Years, if nothing else, would be a sufficient Shield for me in *this* Respect; unless you should *secretly* plunge a Dagger into my Heart; but I have not *quite so vile* an Opinion of You as to suppose you would assassinate me, even though, like *Abner*, you had a Spear, and I, like *Asahel*, had none.

Therefore, Sir, I will *not* swear the Peace against you, but run all Chances of Personal Injury. But your Words will *justly* allow me to put *this* Construction upon them—— That you think you have *not* already said *quite enough* to induce me to put an End to my own Life (though you have represented me to be defective in *Common Sense*, and so vicious in Heart as to be unfit for my Office) but (from the high Opinion you have of your own Talent at Sarcasm) imagining your Gibes and Sneers to be so cutting as to be irresistible, you declare that you " will not be *answerable* for the *Consequences*" if by my *Rashness* I should provoke you to Wrath, so as to write against me a *second* Time; for then, I suppose, you will pour forth upon me such a *Torrent* of Reproaches as will be sufficient to drown me; or, at least, to make me drown myself, or hang myself, or cut my Throat in such a Manner as to divide " the Joints and Marrow."

A very charitable Design indeed! particularly so when it comes from a Man who professes that the Object of his Writing is " alone to seek *Truth*, and for the further Progress
" of

"of *pure* and *genuine* Christianity!" How *truly consistent* that such a Declaration should proceed from a Man who compares himself and Society to that *very respectable* Society whose Institution does Honour to the Heart of its first Promoter,* and the Hearts of those who encourage it, since *one* benevolent Design of it, *amongst others*, is, to rescue those from an untimely Death, whom Despair had driven to the Brink of Perdition. But lest the Members of this truly laudable Society, should want Objects for the Exercise of their benevolent Skill, it seems, Sir! you are willing to give them a *Chance* of trying some Experiments on *my* Body. I thank you, Sir, for your kind and *pious* Intention towards me; but beg leave to *hint* to you, that I am not so weary of Existence *Here*, nor so distrustful of an *Hereafter*, as to be induced to lay violent Hands on myself from any Thing that *You* can say.

I have no doubt but you thought that I a young Man "of little Learning and of less Religion, *as You fear*" (P. 86.) should be terrified with your Anathemas, and tremble at your Word as a Lap Dog would at the Roaring of a Lion; but, Sir, I am not "much hurt by your *illiberal* Reflections" (P. 31. 1st. Defence) "nor vexed by such *low Abuse* as "Yours" (P. 92.) I am not only undismayed by your Ridicule but I *despise* it. I "despise the Work of thine Hands," Job. x. 3. for Benson "hath spoken without Knowledge, and "his Words are without Wisdom," Job xxxiv. 35. "his "Wisdom *faileth* him" Eccles. x. 3. and therefore he shooteth his Arrows, even bitter Words. Ps. lxiv. 3. Now Mr. Benson let me tell you that these Arrows are blunt-pointed; they cannot enter. Perhaps, Sir, there is no Man who feels less from being ridiculed and reviled than I do. My Mind,

* Dr. Hawes.

I thank God (however thankless you may adjudge me) is of *firmer* Texture than to be made wretched by a Sneer, or a whole Volume of Sneers. However tauntingly I may be argued with, and however pointed may be the Irony of my Adversary, yet I will never be *ridiculed* out of my Reason, nor *bantered* out of my Understanding. That which cool Reason shall dictate will I boldly Assert, and firmly adhere to, till *cool reasoning* shall convince me of my *Error*; and then I hope never to be so proud in Spirit as not to confess myself wiser than I was before. If, when you alluded to my suffering "some Mortification and Pain of Mind" (P. 13.) you supposed that *your* Remarks would produce those "Disquietudes of Soul," I can assure you that your Expectations are almost wholly frustrated. Not that I can say with St. Paul, "I take *Pleasure* in Reproaches." 11. Cor. xii. 10. Far from it! I could wish to behave myself so wisely, that I may not be evil-spoken of: but your *virulent Invektives* give me less Pain than if they had been such as proceed from the Meekness of Wisdom. Many of your Calumnies are so very *gross* that they confute themselves. Solomon says "The Heart knoweth his own Bitterness." Prov. xiv. 10. Now all the Bitterness I suffer as being Author of the Hints, is not from being reviled and abused by your malicious Sneers, but from having said *too much*; more than I need to have said, for *Qui nimis probat, probat nihil*, he who proves too much, in fact, proves nothing; that is, a Man often weakens his Cause by saying *too much*.—This has been my Case; but as the *burnt Child dreads the Fire* (excuse this *Vulgarism*, Sir) I shall be more circumspect in this Reply.

In P. 29. you enter upon a Refutation of one Passage of mine, which has been treated by You, in a manner that proves you a Sophist and *Caviller*, but wretchedly destitute of that Ingenuoufness of Disposition, that *Integrity of Heart*, which every Man ought to possess who declares that he is in

Search

Search of Truth, and Truth alone. But it is evident, from hence, that *You* are *not* that *Man*; You are the Advocate of a Party; the Champion of a Cause, determined to contend for it Right or Wrong; rather than the honest Enquirer after Truth. If it was not so, you would not have dared so infamously to interpret my Sentiments; and to put such a Gloss on my Words that they appear to signify what never yet was meant. Exclusively of this base Attempt to pervert the Tenor of my Sentiments, I must *accuse* you of Conduct the most unfair and unpardonable that an Adversary can be guilty of. You have given a *mutilated* Quotation; and have therein put a false Concord which you did not find in my Pamphlet. On this account I must give the Lines a Place here, to rectify the Passage to the World, and thereby to give a Specimen of *your* Justice and Regard to Truth. Having urged you to preach on a certain given Subject, I said, "and by the Force of your Eloquence to prove to Mankind that the Impiety of the "Lives of their Clergy, (*if they happened to live under the Ministry of such Wretches*) did not in the least deprive them of "any Benefits to be derived from the Means of Grace which "Christ had promised them through the Functions of the "Priestly Office." (P. 9. Hints) Now you *artfully* omitted the Words in the Parenthesis here put in Italics, because you well knew that their Appearance would at once overturn the Construction which you afterwards put upon them, and which enabled you to fill up seven or eight Pages with *Scripture* and *Irony*; taking Care to repeat, seven Times, three little Words [IN THE LEAST] represented thus in large Letters, that they may be more *emphatically* sneering. Had you quoted *fairly*, any honest impartial Reader, would immediately have perceived that my Meaning could *not* be what you have stated it to be, as, within the Parenthesis, I applied, the odious Appellation of *Wretches*, to impious Ministers; and consequently I could never *design* to say what you have taken

the unjust Liberty to say for me. But some Men will stick at nothing! no Means, however iniquitous, shall be left *un-
tried*, so they can but succeed in their Designs.

Had I said what *here* follows, "and by the Force of
"your Eloquence to prove to Mankind, that their Salvation
"would be *as much forwarded* by ungodly and profane Mini-
"sters, as by the most godly, the most zealous and devout"
—*then*, Sir, I had fairly deserved to be the Object of your
Raillery, and the Places of Scripture, which you quoted
against me, had been as Coals of Fire heaped on my Head,
convicting and *convincing* me of having spoken *Blasphemy*
against the *Word of God*; but at present they only serve as
Monuments to *disgrace* the Man who can so unfairly quote,
so iniquitously comment, and so impiously misapply. But
now, Sir, for the *Confirmation* of my Words.—I was there
supposing the *official Duties* of the impious Clergy to be re-
gularly attended to; that is to say, that they *pray, preach, and*
administer the Sacraments; and these, you know, are called
Means of Grace!

At the same Time I supposed their own Lives not to be
holy and corresponding to these Ordinances, and the Instruc-
tions they give to the People. You indeed say, that if an
ungodly Man go out to teach at all, he will teach *Ungodliness*
by *Precept*, or *Example*, or both; (22) and that his *Doctrine*
must be *as bad* as his *Life* (22), but I deny the Position so
far as *Precept* is concerned. One cannot presume that any
Clergyman, however bad may be his Life (whether Drunk-
ard, Blasphemer, or Adulterer) would be *weak* enough (set-
ting aside the *Impiety*) to advance, in his Discourses, Doc-
trines of the same Criminal Tendency; that if he should be
a Drunkard himself, he would recommend others to "tarry
long at the Wine;" and so on of any other Vice to which
he may be addicted.

Well,

Well, Sir! will you, now, say that the Efficacy of these Ordinances depends upon the Piety of the Person who administers them? Are the *public Prayers* of the Church to be rejected, and not to enter into the Presence of the Lord, and will He not hearken to their Petitions nor grant their Requests, because they are offered by a Minister whose Life is ungodly? I am well aware, Sir, that it is said, "The effectual fervent Prayer of a righteous Man availeth much;" and also that "the Prayers of the Wicked are an Abomination to God:" but the Tenor of these Passages is to be taken in an *Individual* Sense, applied to every Man *singly*, and not to a Man who is the *Mouth* of a Congregation (as Ministers are), for while *his own* Prayer may be abominable on account of his Wickedness, there may be some righteous Men in the Congregation who join with him in the *same Prayers*, which may nevertheless ascend to the Lord as a sweet-smelling Savour.

As to the *Eucharist* or Lord's Supper, the faithful and well-informed Believer does not deem the Benefits of that solemn Banquet dependent on the Person through whose Hands he receives the heavenly Food, as the *Servant* of the Lord Jesus, but he looks up to the great High Priest himself, who will cause it to be unto him the Food of Eternal Life.

As to *Preaching*, though I admit that the Words which issue from a good Man sink deeper, and make more Impression upon the Generality of his Hearers, than those uttered by a Man whose Profligacy is so notorious, that his Life is a Negation to his Precepts, yet the same Words are *the same Words* come from whom they may; as Gold is still Gold however it may pass through dirty Fingers. Pray! Sir! is your Conscience so very scrupulous that you would refuse a Guinea if it should be offered or brought to you by a Collier with dirty Hands, or even by a Person so given up to *Iniquity* as to be unto every good Work reprobate. I rather think

think you would *pocket the Affront* with fewer censorious Remarks upon the Person, than what I have received for offering You, and your Brethren in Error, *a few Hints*.— Thus, Sir, ought Men to act when the Riches of *Grace* are brought to them ! they should not *so much* consider the Purity and Cleanliness of the Bearer as the Value of the Gift. A Sermonic Writer, in the early Part of the last Century, (*Mr. Henry Smith*) judiciously observes. (P. 307.) that “Elijah did not refuse his Food because it was brought to him by “*Ravens* instead of *Doves*.” Now, Sir, these Birds are not as celebrated for their Innocence as Doves are, and yet it seems a Prophet of God did not scruple to take his Sustainance from such impure Bearers of it ; *because* he knew it was sent to him from God. Here, Sir ! you see the Almighty makes use of an impure Instrument to carry Food to his Prophet ; and thus if, in his Wisdom, he shall think fit to convey the Spiritual Food of our Souls by an ungodly Minister, we are not to reject it on that Account, but to partake of the Repast, with Gratitude to the Being who sent it.

If then you will be so good as to exercise your Skill in Composition, and make a Discourse for me relative to this Doctrine, according to the Sense of the Words *here given* I can assure You, Sir, that I have not *the least* Objection to undertake the Mission you propose to me (P. 33.) but will preach it in as many Cathedrals, Churches, Chapels, and Methodist Chapels (I was going to say Methodist *Meeting-houses* but that might have offended You) as shall be open to “so promising “a Missionary.” (P. 34.) [But, by the bye, Sir, as you say I need not fear the Censure of my *Superiors* for doing so, being an extraordinary Case (and of Course *extraordinary Cases* are a Sanction for *extraordinary Improprieties of Conduct*, at least Mr. Benson hints as much, (P. 34.) will you be so good as to indemnify me ; by undergoing, in my Stead, such Punishment, as they, in their Wisdom, shall think proper to inflict upon

upon me? This, Sir! is a Point of Prudence that I ought to attend to.] Upon a Topic of this Kind, if you make a judicious Sermon for me, there is no Doubt but "*the Effects of my Elocution will be astonishing*" (P. 33.) and the probable Consequence will be, that, as the *Generality* of the People will be convinced there is *no Necessity* to have Methodist Teachers *any longer*, their Chapels will be converted into some *useful Manufactories*, and the Nation will become a *more* happy and united People, fervent in Spirit serving the Lord, not running after seducing Teachers but minding their Worldly Business six Days in seven, and their Religion more duly on the Sabbath, "labouring with their Hands the Thing which is good, so as not merely to supply their own Wants, but to have to give to him that needeth." Ephef. iv. 28.

I now proceed to P. 31. wherein you have been so kind not only to select a few Texts for my Choice as the Theme of the Sermon (you propose for me to preach) but have been at the Pains to comment upon them, and to give some "general Outlines of the Sermon sketched chiefly (as you say) by my Pencil" (P. 38.) but as I say *not at all*, for, as I have just before *proved*, my Meaning has been most infamously misrepresented. However, Sir, as you have given me these Texts to choose out of, I shall take *the first*; and you will give me leave now to state to You in what Manner I should discourse upon it before an Assembly of the *Godly* in a Methodist Chapel. Here let us suppose that I have entered upon the Mission, and my Sermon been approved of in our Cathedrals and Churches. I then "*condescend* so far as to enter your Chapels" (P. 34.) and you will therefore imagine me now ascending the Pulpit-Steps, not in the Style of those *Petit-Maitre* Parsons whom the amiable Cowper (in his Task, Book 2d.) so justly and humorously describes as "skipping up and then skipping down again," but with as much solemn Deliberation as though my Toes were Victims to hard Drinking,

ing, and *reeling* about the Streets. Safely arrived to the Summit of my Journey, I send forth a gentle *Hem* or two, and then in a Style of Methodist Sanctity, I softly pronounce, *Let us—offer up—our Hearts to God—Brethren—by Prayer.*—Then, Sir, like one of the Hypocritical Professors of Religion described in 23d. Ch. of St. Matthew, for a *Pretence* I make a long Prayer, repeating the same Thing a great many Times, lest God should not *hear* me, for, (as Elijah said *sneeringly* to the Prophets of Baal) he might be *talking*, or, “peradventure he *sleepeth*, and must be awaked” 1. Kings, xviii. 27. Having proceeded thus far *secundum Artem*, or disguised under the Hypocrite’s Mask, I next give out the Text as follows,—“*The 34th Part—of the Prophecy—of the Prophet—Ezekiel—from the 2d. to the 7th. Division of it.*”—Hem! In this Manner, Sir, would I name the Text, by way of ingratiating myself with my Hearers, because, if I was to say, At the 34th. Chap. of Ezekiel, (or, of the Prophet Ezekiel) from the 2nd. to the 7th Verse, you will find these Words, *that* would be acting too much after the Manner of the *profane* and *ungodly* Ministers of the *Established* Church, and by that means my Hearers may instantly conceive a Prejudice against me, which all the Force of my Arguments, however cogent, would not be able to remove; and consequently I should “open my Mouth to them in vain.” The Place of the Text thus named, with a *certain* Solemnity of Countenance, and proper *Contractions* of the Lips, I proceed, with due Deliberation and strong Emphasis, to recite the Words, *Thus saith—the Lord God—unto the Shepherds; —Woe! be—to the Shepherds of Israel, &c. &c.*

You, Sir, well know, for beyond all Doubt you have practised it yourself, that it is the Business, *the incumbent Duty*, of every public Speaker (if he wishes to succeed in the Objects of his Eloquence) to endeavour to impress his Hearers with a *good Opinion* of Him.—On this Principle then, Sir, having

having thus specified the Purport of my Message to them; I make a sufficient Pause, and elevate my Eyes *towards the Ceiling*; because, Sir, that God who dwelleth in the Heavens (and whose Presence pervadeth *every* Place, beholding the Evil and the Good, because this omnipresent Being) must be necessarily more visible on the *Ceiling* than he is on the *Floor*, therefore I cast my Eyes, with pious Glances, towards that Place where he “dwelleth between the Cherubims.”* This answers my Purpose, for the Saints instantly believe that I am (like the wise Woman who reasoned with Job) “One of them that are faithful in Israel,” 11. Sam. xx. 17. for say they, ‘in what a *fine, solemn* Manner he has given out the Text.’—Now, Sir, though I ought, by way of securing to me a favourable Attention during the whole Discourse, to strive to retain upon my Features that *demure* Sanctity of Countenance so essential to One who is to speak “to the “Saints and faithful Brethren in Christ,” Coloss. i. 2. yet, Sir, I must confess that I cannot play the Hypocrite *so long*, consequently “the Door of my Mouth” will not move upon its Hinges in that *slow and gradual* Manner which it did during the Time of reciting the Text; but (my Countenance *duly* serious, and) my Voice impressed with that Firmness of Tone which becomes a Man who knows himself in a *right* Cause, I begin my Discourse as follows,

BRETHREN !

THE Words of our Text are so numerous, so crowded with Metaphors, and the Matter they signify so various and important, that if I was to

* I am sensible that your Places of Worship have no such Sculpture on the Ceiling as is frequently to be met with in our Churches, but, Sir, the Phrase I made use of is from *Scripture*; and that, *you* know, will of course justify the Introduction of it, *whether applicable or not*.

explain to Ye each Particular, it would require that I should preach till *Midnight*; [*I am supposing, Sir, this to be an Evening Discourse*] but there are some Points much more necessary to be known by You than Others, and on *these* I shall principally expatiate. “Woe be to the Shepherds of Israel,” &c. Here you see that God has denounced Woe against those Shepherds who do not feed the Sheep and Lambs of God; therefore it behoves them to look well to their Conduct that they do not come under this Condemnation. My Brethren! the Impiety of some of the Shepherds of this Land, and their shameful Neglect of their Pastoral Duties, is a Cause of Grief to all serious and considerate Christians, and sincerely do such Persons pray that God would give us Pastors according to his Heart, who shall feed us with Knowledge and Understanding, &c. [*as much more said as one may naturally suppose would ensue from such a Theme,*] However there is a Circumstance necessarily arising out of this Subject, to which I must beg leave to direct your Minds, as perhaps you have not hitherto been duly aware of its Consequence to You. You have refused to associate with those that are not so *holy* as you are, and have followed your own Lusts in the Choice of Teachers. You have come out from among your once Fellow-worshippers in the Church, because some of the Ministers are not what please You. You think they do not feed the Flock of Christ as they ought

ought to do, neither giving them their Meat in due Season nor filling them with that which is good, but giving them the dry Herbs which are gathered out of the Fields of Morality. This you think justifies your Separation, or in plain Terms, you have in great Part quitted the Church and mostly resort to these Places, because the Ministers are not free from all Infirmary, and because there are some other of its Members who are not so pious as they ought to be, and some flagrantly wicked. This, I say, you think is sufficient Cause for you to separate, and withdraw yourselves from them. But I think you are mistaken, for you should recollect that the Jews were reprehended by the Prophet Isaiah, as being displeasing to God because they kept others *from them* (which is tantamount to keeping themselves from others) on a Principle of Pride and Self-righteousness, saying, "Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou."* Isaiah lxxv. 5. Now please to attend for a few Minutes to what the Prophet Ezekiel says in the 5th Verse, of our Text. "And they were scattered because there was no Shepherd: and they became *Meat* to all the *Beasts* of the Field when they were scattered." Now this cannot have been your Case: you never were *without* a Shepherd; though perhaps your Shep-

* See Note.

herd was not as diligent and attentive to Ye as he ought to have been. However the Case is precisely the same *in Effect* when the Sheep *wander from* the Shepherd, as when they are *without* one. They become Meat to the Beasts of the Field: they are liable to be seized upon by the Voraciousness of every Beast of Prey that shall go about seeking something to devour. We are not told that if the Sheep will fly from these negligent Shepherds, the Lord will unite them, and give them such faithful Shepherds that they shall not be scattered any more, but it is said when the Sheep *were* scattered they became Meat to the Beasts of the Field. St. John in his Gospel says when the Shepherd leaveth his Sheep and fleeth, (or, which is equally fatal in consequence, when the Sheep leave the Shepherd, and stray in Parties from under his Care) the *Wolf* catcheth them, and scattereth them. Now what does the Prophet or Evangelist mean by the *Beasts of the Field*, and *Wolves*? Why, Brethren! this is a figurative Way of Speaking, wherein they evidently signify *False Teachers*! Men who lie in wait to deceive if it were possible even the very Elect. These are those Lions that are greedy of Prey, and as it were young Lions lurking in secret Places. Psalm xvii. 12. These are they "who will go round about the City, and wander up and down for *Meat*;" for Profelytes or Converts to their Doctrine, "and grudge if they be not satisfied;"

that

that is, will accuse you with wilful Blindness; or wonder at your Darkness, that you cannot see clearly the Way of Life (which *they* profess to teach) from the Way of Perdition as taught in the Churches of this Land. This Brethren is the true Meaning of Beasts of the Field, and the People (well-meaning but easily deluded People) are the *Meat* of these *Beasts*, the Prey of these *Lions* and *Wolves*; for it is from the Bounty of the People they are fed, and clothe themselves with your Wool; "they kill with the Poison of their *false Doctrine* those they found fed already." (P. 36.) that is, such as have been taught by the *regular Ministers* right Notions of Religion they confound and bewilder by their subtle Dealings and perverted Applications of Scripture. In this respect they may be compared to the Whore in the Proverbs, "With their much fair Speech they cause the *Unwary* to yield." These are such Prophets as Ezekiel describes in his 33d Chapter: "Who prophesy out of their own Hearts, and follow their own Spirit." These are those Shepherds who have their "right Eyes darkened," and their wrong Eyes opened. These are they who have climbed over the Wall into the Sheep-fold. These are those blind Guides who strain at a Gnat and swallow a Camel; i. e. they exhort the People to forsake their Teachers if they are not as perfect as Angels, for that it is a Sin (although my Brethren it is but a *Gnat-like* Sin

Sin at the worst), to live under the Ministration of the Word by *ungodly* Men; but at the same Time they can swallow the Camel-like Sin (for *their* Consciences have large Throats, they are like open Sepulchres, they can readily gorge the Camel-like Sin) of *Schism*, or creating Divisions in the Church.—Of all the Evils that Men can suffer none is more lamentable than that of being deluded into by-ways with the false Light of Schismatic Teachers of Religion, for, as an old Poet observes, there is

“No Poison worse than Scripture falsely taught.”

“Therefore, O ye Children! hearken to me now,
“and attend to the Words of my Mouth.”
Prov. vii. 24.

[But no such Thing, Sir! There is an Uproar in the Assembly! They all come upon me with one Accord: they are instant with loud Voices declaring to have me (I will not say crucified, but) thrust out of the Meeting. ‘Down with him! Down with him! And let not such a Fellow as this get ‘into our Pulpit again! What! does he come here to abuse us ‘to our Faces in our *own* Sion? We know more of *Scripture* ‘than he does! We are wiser than such Teachers as *Him*! ‘Away with the Babbler! We will not hear him any longer!’

Now, Sir, as I am not of a *very* timid Disposition, nor readily frightened; and as I have learnt (*from the Bible*, Sir) that the Apostles themselves were sometimes subject to these Inconveniencies of having whole Assemblies up in Arms against them, owing to the Judaical or Mosaical Bigotry of the Hearers of their Doctrine, so I endeavour to pacify the Tumult, and to still the Waves of their Anger by such Means as the Apostles generally had recourse to,—“I beckon

“to

“to them with the Hand,” I hold up a *white Handkerchief* as a Flag of Truce to stop further Hostilities,—loudly vociferating Hear me! hear me! if it be but a Minute or two longer! I speak as to *wise Men* (*Prudence, Sir, suggests to me to use this Address to them, whatever I may think*), “Judge ye what I say.”—However they are like the deaf Adder (I do not mean to say they refuse to hear the Voice of the *Charmer*; but) they refuse to hear the Voice of a Preacher who will point to them the Error of their Ways. ‘Out with him! Out with him! Let not such a profane Wretch pollute our Sanctuary with his perverse Doctrine. Let not such a *Goat* remain among God’s *Sheep* any longer! Catch him by the Beard, and Out with him! Out! Out! Out!

Regard to *Self-preservation* induces me to comply rather than be—not merely *knocked down*, but—*knocked in the Head*; and, Sir, I do assure you I would not wish to be so served, even if the Stroke was to come from the Arm of a *Saint*: Thus I am obliged to skip down again rather *faster* than I skip up, and leave my Oration unfinished. However, Sir, as I am thus prevented from concluding my primary Harangue to the Methodists (though *nearly the same* Discourse was well received in our *Cathedrals* and *Churches*) you will give me leave to present you with a Sight of the Remainder, in almost the same Style I should have spoken to them, had I been suffered to proceed.—The last Words I uttered before the Uproar commenced, were, Harken to me now, O ye Children, and attend to the Words of my Mouth.—]

Therefore, that is to say, by means of these subtle Dealings (for as “knowledge is easy to him that understandeth,” so an artful *seemingly* pious Man can easily impose upon “the simple who believeth every Word,” therefore I say) the People fall

fall unto them, and thereout suck they no small Advantage, "making a Gain of Godliness."

Its very true, indeed! they amuse You with Accounts of their *great Zeal* for propagating the Gospel of Christ; that "with great Expence and Labour, they build Chapels and Preaching-houses in all the British Dominions in Europe, in the West Indies, and in the northern Continent of America, for the *sole Purpose* of having the Doctrines of our Church" (that is of the *Gospel* by their own Confession) taught in those Places; and that they keep *many hundreds* of Men "employed in travelling about from Day to Day, to spread the Knowledge of these Doctrines." (P. 40) So far, my Brethren, the Methodist Teachers have an Advantage over the Clergy of this Country duly appointed to watch over your Souls; for while many of us can scarce *afford* to travel twenty Miles from Home, *these Men* are travelling from Country to Country, (acquiring thereby a *practical* Knowledge of the World,) and their travelling Expences defrayed out of the Purse of the too credulous *John Bull*; or, in plain Terms, out of the Pockets of *unsuspecting* Englishmen; who never once consider the *enormous* Sum requisite to maintain *many Hundreds of Travellers* Day after Day. I am not *at present* prepared to give you an accurate Statement of it, but it would *astonish* You beyond what you can now suppose! It would require no very mean Arithmetician to *calculate* the Sum annually expended

ed to support these Men. It cannot be denied that they do erect such Buildings; nor can such Edifices be raised without Expence and Labour. As to the Labour I will not say it is *wholly their* Business, for perhaps there are as many (or more) of our profane and ungodly Men who "make Bricks for them, or hew Stones out of the Rock, and daub their Hands in the tempered Mortar," with which such Houses are built, as there are Brick-Makers and Masons out of the Society of Saints. So far I believe we lend them a helping Hand to erect *Gospel-Shops* (as they are *foolishly* termed by some) in Opposition to our Churches; and so far perhaps we do not study our own Peace, however it may be to the Profit of *some* of us to serve them. A prudent General certainly would neither lend nor hire his Soldiers to assist an Enemy to raise Fortifications from whence *they* might batter at and annoy his Citadel.

As to the Expence which I was going to mention, I believe *that* is wholly their own. But then where is the Money obtained from that *pays* the Expence? Why from You, the People, who follow them into these Houses. You are the *Meat* that feeds these Beasts of Prey, and it is the *Fleeces* of You, the Sheep, which pay for the Building of those Dens where they lie in Wait to catch the Poor; and where they do catch the Poor (and sometimes the Rich too) when they draw them into their Net of strong Delusion (I will not say of

curfing, but) of Lies; the Delufion of believing every Passage of Scripture, however unfairly applied to ferve their Interests.

These Things Brethren have I thought proper to fpeak unto Ye. Whether or not I have fspoken “found Speech” I fhall refer to your Judgments; and fhall now finifh this Difcourfe with a Quotation from the 1ft. Ch. of Solomon’s Proverbs, 17th. Verfe.

“Surely *in vain* the *Net* is *spread* in the *Sight* of “*any Bird*.” So I hope as I have now endeavour’d to convince you of your Error, that ye will be no longer caught in the Net fpread forth by the *Methodiftic* Teachers.

Finally Brethren, Farewell! and the Lord be with you all; Amen, Amen!

SUCH, Mr. Benson, is the Sermon I fhould have preached from the Words you gave for a Theme, if I had been allowed to go from the *Alpha* to the *Omega* of it. I have not a Doubt of its being a Difcourfe of that Kind (fo well compofed, fo happily expreffed, and in fhort, Sir, fo much *ad Rem*, or fo much to the Purpose), that it will “re-duce you to this Dilemma” (P. 18) either to make you confefs that you had moft ftupidly miftaken a plain Sentence, or moft *bafely* endeavour’d to warp and mifreprefent it; and in either Cafe had been weak enough, or impious enough, to mifapply the Paffage from Ezekiel, as it tells more againft You than for You. Thus, Sir, have I prefented you with a Specimen of my Skill in the fermonizing Art.

O Benson! Benson! (fee P. 23. 1ft. Def. O Simon! Simon!) faintly as thou art thought to be, learned as thou art

art said to be, and *acute* as (I guess) thou *thinkest* thyself to be, I cannot but abhor thy Impiety and pity the Weakness frequently shewn in thy "farther Defence." Though at first I judged myself inferior to Thee in arguing, and many of thy weak Principles appeared to me as "strong Reasons," Isaiah xli. 21. yet I now see their Fallacy, my Mind is opened to discern more clearly Good from Evil, Truth from Error, and I now find myself able to foil thee in most Places with Weapons of thine own Choice: nay! to wrest the Sword out of thine Hand, and then cut thee down with that *very* Instrument with which Thou didst intend to *kill* me. There are indeed *some* Points that will induce me to cry out *Cedo tibi Bensone*, and when thou hearest those Words, surely thou wilt "not make me afraid, neither shall "thy Hand be heavy upon me" Job xxxiii. 7.

But wilt, in Mercy, spare me; for, you know,

"Tis Honour to forgive a *yielding* Foe."

With respect to your Definition of Schism, I shall not contend with you by Reasoning of my own Head, which (as you say) is weak, and therefore I ought not to pretend to be any Judge in Literature, particularly when the Opinion of so *great* a Man as yourself is in the opposite Scale. It is *possible*, Sir, that your Definition of Schism, *may* be right, but my Course of Reading has taught me to think *otherwise*. I could quote to you some Names, whose Theological Characters, as *sound Divines*, stand as high in Repute, as those *You* have named, from whose Writings, as Comments on the Bible, I have received my Notions of *Schism*.

Of these I shall name but two, Dr. Scott, (Author of the Christian Life and Sermons, in two folio Volumes) and Mr. Theophilus Churchman, (Author of the History of Episcopacy, in one small quarto*) either of whom, I think,

* See Note.

may be fairly deemed as good a Spiritual Guide, as the great Joseph Benson, or still greater John Wesley. Now in a Pamphlet containing less than 100 Pages, such as I intend this to be, it would be absurd to introduce *long* Quotations, and therefore shall here request such of my impartial Readers, as wish to have "a more perfect Knowledge of this Matter," to refer to either of those two Writers for a Solution of any Doubts they may have respecting *Schism*, Bishops and Presbyters, &c. wherein they will find so clear and cogent a Style of Reasoning, that such as are not wilfully determined to persist in Error, will endeavour to keep the *Unity of the Church*; and be satisfied, that *Episcopacy* is an Institution from *Christ*, and that Bishops and Presbyters are *not* in *every* respect equal; but (as I said in a Note subjoined to my Hints) that there are some Duties *peculiar* to the highest Rank of the Pastoral Office, *exclusive* of those which they have in common with other Priests. When Mankind shall be satisfied of *this*, (and they who will but read the Bible *impartially* will have no Reason to doubt of it) it will be evident to them that they ought not to give heed to those seducing Spirits, who endeavour to lead them into separate Congregations, with the Pretence of greater Godliness under the Rule of *Elders*. Dr. Scott having clearly defined wherein Schism consists, treats of it under these three Points, *First* that Schisms and unnecessary Deviations from Church Communion do naturally sour the Tempers of Men, and render them peevish and uncharitable towards each other,—*Secondly*, as leading to the foulest Hypocrisies, and *Thirdly*, as tending to downright Irreligion. (See P. 136. Christian Life.)

Mr. Churchman in Chapter iv. of the 2nd *Part*, quotes two Passages from *St. Cyprian* and *St. Jerom* Cyprian, in his Epistle to Cornelius, useth these Words, *Inde enim Schismata, &c.* "From hence do arise Schisms and Heresies, whilst
"the Bishop, being but *one* in every Church, is slighted
" by

“by the *proud Presumption* of some Men, &c.”—But, says Mr. Churchman, because it may possibly be thought that Cyprian (as being himself a *Bishop*) might be partial in the heightening of his own Authority, I shall crave leave to back him with St. Hierome’s Words, none of the greatest *Fautors* of Episcopacy, who affirms as much; and tells us plainly that the Safety of the Church depends on the chief Priest or Bishop “*Cui si non exors et ab omnibus eminens detur Potestas*” “to whom, in case there be not given an eminent and transcendent Power, there will shortly be *as many Schisms* in the Church as Priests.”

Now, Mr. B. I do not pretend to Infallibility in Judgment. I may be deceived. Neither my Years nor Abilities exempt me from Mistakes and Errors; but this I must say, that, after the most *impartial*, and not negligent, Enquiries into the Nature of Schism, I am induced to think you Methodists guilty of it, as I said in my Hints. Till you can prove that your *needless* separation from Us, and your very general Revilings of Us, do not cause uncharitable Divisions in the Church, you must give me leave to consider you as Schismatics. Whilst you are arguing this Subject, you say (P. 45.) that only the *truly pious* are Members of Christ’s mystical Body. What you mean by the *truly pious* I have no precise Idea of. If you intend to say that *Hypocrites* are not Members of Christ’s mystical Body, I accord with you in Sentiment, as I believe also that many there are who *preach* Christ, who do it more out of *Strife*, and a Disposition to create Divisions, than from Good-will, or sincere Faith in the Redemption wrought for us by the Blood of Jesus. But if by the *truly pious* you mean the *most perfect and devout*, and that None else are to be deemed Members, I cannot subscribe to your Opinion: for as a Limb which is not *perfectly* sound is still a Member of the Human Body, so I believe that a Person whose Piety is *sometimes* imperfect and his Faith wa-
vering

vering, is still a Member of Christ; as Peter was not excluded from his Apostleship, although at one Time he was so faithless as even to deny his Lord and Master.

In P. 52, after having given me some sharp sneering Rebukes for my Remarks on the Manner in which our Visitations are attended to, and for which I fairly lie open to *much* Censure, though not to *so much* as you have so liberally bestowed upon me ever after you adverted to this Weakness of mine, you proceed thus, "I really think you deserve and I dare say, *at the next Visitation*, will meet with a *severe* Reprimand (if you have not met with one already) from your Superiors, for exposing in this Manner the Nakedness of your Mother and Brethren." How kind was this Conduct of Yours towards my Superiors! Not only to tell them what you think their Duty, but to give them a Rule for the Exercise of it. It seems that simply to *reprimand* me had not been enough but it must be done with *Severity*. Such, at least, is the Opinion of Mr. Benson, regardless of that Precept which St. Paul gives to the Galatians, "Brethren, if a Man be overtaken in a Fault, ye which are spiritual restore such an one in the Spirit of Meekness; considering thyself, lest Thou also be tempted." Ch. vi. 1.

But, Sir, though You may *wish* them to come upon me "with a *Rod*, not in Love, and in the Spirit of Meekness," 1. Cor. iv. 21. yet you must permit me an inferior *offending* Minister of the established Church to tell you that the Superiors of that Church do know more of the *Power of the Keys*, and the true Spirit of Church Discipline according to *Evangelical* Directions than to punish Delinquents in such an *unmerciful* Manner as You recommend. They have considered what St. Matthew has mentioned in the 18th. Ch. of his Gospel, V. 15, 16, and 17, and which I think you ought to have considered, before you ventured to give them Directions how they ought to walk. But admitting they were disposed to "re-
buke

"buke me before all that others also may fear" to offend in like manner, yet at present, Sir, I am out of the Reach of *their* Jurisdiction; being removed into the Diocese of Litchfield and Coventry (to the Town of Stafford); so that you are not now "situated at such a Distance from me" (P. 7) as you were when you wrote the Reply to my Hints: and, as we approximate in Residence, the Obstacle to a Conference grows less, and therefore, Sir, I may *perhaps* pay you a Visit *in Person* before these Sheets are out of the Press: not for the Purpose of using *knock-down* Arguments, but to hear your Doctrine, to improve by your Eloquence, and to make myself known to you, that we may "plead together" Isaiah xliiii. 26. as Men in search of *Truth*; and for this Purpose "I would fill my Mouth with Arguments," Job xxiii. 4. though perhaps your Mind may be such that I cannot "*turn* you." However if my Crime is such as to *deserve* a public Reprehension before private Remonstrance has been tried, I am still as much liable to the Censure of the Ecclesiastic Rulers of this Archdeaconry of Stafford as I was in that of Worcester; for I declare (on the Condition of forfeiting my Honour and "good Name" if any Man can prove the contrary) that I had not the *most distant* Allusion to that, or any Archdeaconry in particular, more than to others: but was *general* in my Censure when I said (*what I still persist to say*) that our Visitations are little better than Meetings *pro Forma*; that is to say, neither Morals of Priests nor People are *investigated* as they *ought* to be; or, if they are, we must not only be an "holy Nation" but "a *peculiar* People," for there are seldom any Accusations brought at such Times against obstinate and flagrant Offenders either *Clerics* or *Laymen*; and I presume there are *some* (indeed too many!) of both Sorts to be met with in all Kingdoms and Nations upon Earth.

In P. 53, you seem to blame me because I "*fustigate* my "Friends as well as Enemies," high as well as low, "Arch-
"deacons,

"deacons, Rectors, Vicars, and Curates," as well as, that sanctimonious Body of People the Methodists. Now the *Levitical* Law said "Thou shalt not respect the Person of the Poor, nor honour the Person of the Mighty: but in Righteousness shalt thou judge thy Neighbour." xix. 15. In the Proverbs we are told that "to have Respect of Persons is not good; for, for a Piece of Bread that Man will transgress." Ch. xxviii. 21. And the Apostle directs us to do nothing by Partiality. 1st. Tim. v. 21. *So far* I think my Conduct was in Conformity to these Directions.

I am not unmindful that the "Elders who rule well" should be counted worthy of double Honour;" particularly so when they answer to What the Apostle requires they should, viz. as "labouring in the Word and Doctrine:" 1. Tim. v. 17. I likewise remember that we are forbidden to speak "Evil of the Ruler of the People." Acts xxiii. 5. Now whether we consider this of the King as Supreme, or extend it to those who rule *under him*, "for the Punishment of Evil Doers and the Praise of them that do well," still its Force is binding upon our Consciences; and even so that we should "not speak Evil one of another:" neither Laymen of Laymen, nor Clerics of Clerics; nor Laymen of Clerics, nor Clerics of Laymen.

But to point out wherein our Superiors do *not* rule well, in my Opinion, is not to speak Evil of them; but, on the Contrary, no more than what is Right: for as the Great ought to be more circumspect in their Conduct, as they are like *Cities set on Hills*, so Mankind ought to be more vigilant to detect their *Misconduct* and to urge them to "behave themselves wisely," as every Vice they commit is of more malignant Tendency and more injurious to the Interests of Virtue than such Transgressions as happen among the inferior Orders of Mankind. Therefore, Sir, I said that our Visitations were not conducted as they ought to be; and I say
so

so still :* for I am not a Man of such a Temper as to be *frightened* from saying what I deem the Truth : and, Sir, to prove to you (if you are not too scrupulous to take it for a Proof) that I am not so completely a Slave to Avarice and Fear, as to *dread* saying what *may* be a Barrier to my own Interest and Preferment, (as you insinuate in P. 52 and 3) I here assert before You and my Readers, that I am not without Hopes (*principally* from Motives of Regard to *Public Good*, though not wholly unmindful of *Self-Interest*†) that before the Conclusion of *this present Century* (short as the Period will be till it is terminated) or certainly before the *next* shall be far advanced, some Regulation *will* take Place, which shall put the inferior Clergy of this Country in such a State of Ease and Comfort as their *Calling demands* and *entitles them to* ; that is, to enable them to live free from Penury, if they are *frugal*, for we cannot in these Days be

“ Accounted rich with forty Pounds a Year ;”
and also *if it should seem best*, to lessen the enormous Incomes now possessed by some *Dignitaries* : Such Dignitaries I mean as are no where commanded or appointed in the *Scriptures* ; for such we do not want. Perhaps the Property now possessed by them with very little *National Good*, might be much better employed if it was to be applied to the Purpose I have just mentioned,—to augment the Incomes of the Inferior Clergy ; reserving a *capital Fund* sufficient for the Purpose of *building* and *repairing* our Churches. By this means the iniquitous Abuses of Charity upon *Briefs* would be obviated and done away, and the Nation benefited by being freed from such Charges. This would be no sacrilegious Violation of Ecclesiastical Property, but would be really applying it to the *true Interests* of the Church. *How* this is to be done with Judg-

* See Note.

† See Note.

ment requires *abler Heads* than *mine* to arrange the Plan: however, Sir, this is the *undissembled* Language of my Heart; I feel the importance of its Object; and I speak it without Fear of any malicious Comments that *You* may put upon it, or any Dread of *Visitation Reprimands*.

P. 60. "I challenge You, Sir, or *any Man*, to produce "*one single Text* out of the N. T. which gives any, *the least*, "*Hint*, that the Ministers of the Gospel, strictly speaking, "*are to be considered as Priests*."—I am extremely glad, Sir, that You have thus given a *general* Challenge; not confining it to myself alone, nor yet to *Clerics* only, but extending it also to *Laymen*, or *any Man*—Out of so many Persons as you have thus set at Defiance, surely! there are *some* who are fonder of searching the Scriptures than I am (according to what you say) and who will be able to select *one* single Text (if not more) to *hint* at least (if not clearly assert) that the Ministers of the Gospel, *strictly speaking*, *are* to be considered as *Priests*. But before this Point can be argued properly, it is necessary that the Terms of your Proposition should be *clearly* understood.—If by *Ministers of the Gospel* you mean to include *all* those who go by that Name, then, Sir, I am ready to admit that there is *not one* single Text, in either the Old or N. T. which will authorize Mankind to consider *all* of them as *Priests*. Amongst the first to be refused such an Appellation is *Mr. Joseph Benson*; and all such *Self-ordained* Teachers. Whether or not the Ministers of the Gospel, *strictly speaking*, (i. e. such as are duly ordained, and properly sent to minister the Word) are to be considered as *Priests*, I will not *now* argue with You, but shall leave this Point to be contended by some of my Reverend Brethren, or well-disposed Laymen. However, Sir, if you should be found in *this* Instance to have asserted a *Truism* (for most of your Positions *I think* are *Falsisms*) then neither You nor the World can have any Reason to complain of *Priestcraft*: for if there are *no*

Priests

Priests, of course there cannot be any *Priest*-craft, and consequently the Proverb, which you have applied in P. 27. "Like *Priest* like People," is mere Nonsense. and "your whole Argument *there* falls to the Ground" (P. 61.) Thus, Sir, by means of your *deep Counsels* the World is happily freed from the great Evil of Priestcraft. [But by the bye I fear we have not yet got rid of *Minister*-craft. Indeed, if I am not much-deceived, there seems to be more of that Sort of *Craft* in the World now, particularly in *this* Nation, than there ever was Priest-craft at any One Time. However, Sir, I hope the Day is, at no very remote Distance when *Minister*-craft as well as Priest-craft will be exterminated, and when they, "who have now Eyes to see and yet "see not" shall have their Eyes opened to "behold the *Beast* "that *was*, and is not"—the Beast of Schism.]—And when this Nation shall have adopted your Opinion that the *Priesthood* is abolished, then, Sir, it will be necessary to have the whole Rubric altered, and the Book of Offices changed in Phraseology, no longer saying Office for the Ordination of *Priests*, but for the Ordination of *Ministers*; and a Number of such Things that I shall now only mention under the Term of *et ceteras*, &c. &c. &c.

As to your Arguments to prove Episcopacy and Presbytery one and the same Office, I am no further anxious to reply to them, than as it may tend to elucidate the Truth. Self Interest should urge me to be silent, and to admit the Verity of your decisive Language on this Point; because I shall then be myself *equal* to a *Bishop*, and that, you know, must be highly gratifying to that Self-love and secret Exultation which I presume invariably exists in such an "*unregenerate, unconverted*" Mind, as *You* have declared mine to be. It is true, I asserted that Priests were *not* equal to Bishops. The Proof of an Assertion rests upon the Assertor, *Nam Affirmanti incumbit Probatio*; however, Sir, I shall resign this

Defence of my Position to the Bishops themselves, or those who are *in hopes* of attaining to *Lawn Sleeves*, and let them fight the Battles wherein their own Honour is more nearly concerned. My Welfare, (I mean my *Dignity*) will not suffer even if the Bishops should be worsted in this Battle, and be deprived of their *mitred Supremacy*, for I admit with You, that it is not very likely "the Episcopal Crozier will ever be conferred on One who makes such an indiscriminate Use of his Curatical Staff, &c." (P. 53.) So far, Sir, we agree.

Respecting the Persons *by whom* Ordination is to be conferred, I cannot say that we so exactly harmonize in Sentiment. You say (P. 64.) that it mattered nothing "by whom this was done, whether by Apostle, Evangelist, or Elder, if it were but done by those that were proper Judges, were the true Servants of Christ, and *already in the same Ministry*, having been formerly set apart for the same Office by Others."

To prove the *Negative* of this Assertion, you set me at Defiance, and say You are ready to *dispute* it with me *when-ever* I please. From so confident a Challenge as this, it may reasonably be inferred that you are surrounded with a *Panoply*; that you have put on the whole Armour of—Controversy, and are able to stand against the *Wiles* of—a Curate. Fancy paints you to my Mind's Eye, and methinks I now see you in the Room, peeping through the Helmet of *Sophistry*; your Heart guarded with the Breast-plate of *Confidence*; your Loins girt about with *strong Delusion*; your Feet shod with the Gospel of *Methodism*; and above all taking the Shield of *Fanaticism*, wherewith you will be able to repel all the fiery Darts of—*rational Divinity*; and in your Hand the long *Sword* of deep Learning, with which you will give your "*Stripling*" Adversary, such *severe* Strokes that he will be obliged to "*reel*" under the Might of your Arm, and to cry out for Mercy as a vanquished Opponent. So thought the gigantic Goliath

Goliath the Champion of the Philistines ! Confident of Success he *disdained* his Adversary ! But alas ! (how are the mighty fallen !) he fell, he was *knocked down*, by a Pebble-stone hurled from the Sling of the little David ; and so perhaps will the Methodistic *Anakim* Benson, fall by the Pebble of Truth thrown at him by the Curate Ruffel.

Now, Sir, it is a *fortunate* Circumstance that you happened to insert those Words which I have distinguished by Italics, for had you not mentioned the necessity of the Person being *in the Ministry*, who ordains others to preach the Gospel, I should certainly have concluded that it *mattered nothing* if it had been done by an old Woman ; for I presume, Sir, you cannot deny but that old Women may be *true Servants* of Christ, and *proper Judges* of such Persons as are fit for the Ministerial Office : however, Sir, you have not been so polite to the *old Ladies* as to grant them the Privilege of laying on of Hands. Even St. Paul, the *ungallant** St. Paul, was more polite to them than you are, for in his Epistle to Titus he has permitted the " aged Women " to take a *comfortable Drop* now and then, provided they be " not given to *much Wine*," nor get drunk so as to set a bad Example to the *young Women* who are required to be *sober*, " and to love " their Husbands, and their Children." But these things, Sir, are not to the Point we are arguing.—It seems you grant the Power of Ordaining, to the Elders or Presbyters. Now a Priest is a Presbyter. I am a Priest ; therefore you grant it to me. 'No ! (say you) you are neither Priest nor Presbyter. As to a Priest there is *no such Thing*, Sir, *now*. You are at best only a Minister. As to a Presbyter, that you cannot be ; for you are a young Man, " a bold Youth of Yesterday." (P. 86.) Presbyter, Sir, let me tell you, is derived

* See 1. Cor. vii. 1.

from *Πρεσβυς* signifying *Senex*, an old Person.' Mr. B: I thank you for this Etymology. Pray, Sir, when shall I be deemed a Presbyter? And when shall I have this Privilege? 'Why when you are 50 Years old, you shall be deemed 'an Elder.' Very well Sir! Every Man in the Ministry arrived to that Age is an Elder. An Elder is the same thing as a Bishop (see P. 68.). It matters not which of them ordains, consequently every Man who has lived *half a Century* has a Right to ordain such Persons to be Ministers as he shall think properly *qualified* and *called*. What an excellent System of Church Government is this! How much *Trouble* and *Guilt* will it prevent! According to this Plan there will be no need of *Titles* to be given, nor *Testimonials* to be signed.—What a happy Circumstance this for "*Heads of Houses, Tutors and Fellows, Rectors and Vicars*, who (if *You* speak *Truth*) do now sign manifest *Falshoods*!" (P. 26.)

If an Elder wants a Curate, or a *young* Man wishes to take Orders, how *cleverly* may the Wish of either be gratified under this System.

The Candidate for the Ministry (whatever may be his Age, whether *young* or *old*) must for a Time live under the *Eye* of his *Elder*; and then the same Person who gives him his Title will make him a *Parson*,* and its all done as snug as can be under the Roof of his Patron, and Bishop or Elder. What a charming Contrivance! "An Invention, Sir, worthy of your *Methodistic* Head." (P. 76.) How it must tend to keep *improper* Persons out of the Ministry, when, as the Power of granting Orders is multiplied, the Chance of *Caprice* operating is encreased in the same Ratio! And how much are *they* indebted to you who abhor having the Nation full of *Priests* or Ministers! It *cannot* be at all likely that

* See Note.

more will be admitted than are absolutely requisite, because the Power of admitting them will be *then* granted to at least several *Hundreds*, if not some *Thousands*, instead of between two and three dozen as now.

Mr. Benson! *seriously*, I am almost ashamed of treating You, a Methodistic LEADER, with so little *Respect*; but your Argumentation is so *weak*, and of such manifest *evil* Tendency to *orderly* Church Government, that I cannot help *deriding* it; and more particularly so as that is the Way in which you have generally, but not generously, treated me. You have had Recourse to Derision more than to solid Argument, in order to confute the Reasoning in my Hints. Had you ever read a Line which I have in an old Book of Poems, it *might* (I do not say positively *would*, but it *might*) have been useful to you when You set about your "*Farther Defence*;" and perhaps saved You "some Mortification and Pain of Mind." The Poet's Observation is this,

"*Who trusts his Wit, by Wit is soonest tript.*"

On this Principle I treat you with Derision, for He

Who trusts to Sneer, by Sneer shall soonest fall.

If you had ever read the 64th. Psalm with *due* Attention it would have told you that Persons of a certain Description "shall make their own Tongue to fall upon themselves:" Or the Gospel of St. Matthew might have cautioned you against so often thrusting at me with the *Sword* of Sarcasm, for he says, "all they that take the Sword shall perish with the *Sword*," Ch. xxvi. 52. so if you had reasoned with *becoming* Seriousness, I should not have thought of replying to you in any other Manner than with *serious* Argument.

P. 67, You say that the *Dress* of the Person who ordains "is the Ceremonial Part of the Business, and of *no Kind* of Consequence *whatever*."—Now, Sir, should I live till I am old enough to be an Elder, (that is, as before-said, till I am 50), and should I before then have become a Convert to your
Assertion

Assertion that an *Elder* and a *Bishop* are one and the same Person meant in the Scripture, of Course I shall take upon me to ordain others to the Ministerial Office, that they, *in Time*, may become Elders, and so the Eldership not become extinct for Want of Progeny to perpetuate the Race. And now, Sir, I'll tell you the Plan I intend to adopt when I shall take upon me *as an Elder* to ordain.

As "the Dress is of no Kind of Consequence what-ever" I shall purchase one of those Vestments worn in this Country by some of the *Sons of the Whip*, and which is usually denominated a *Smock-Frock*. This, Sir, I shall keep by me, and whenever I shall make any *young Parsons*, will put it on, for you know the Dress is "of no Kind of Consequence *whatever*." Perhaps, before I shall be old enough to have this Power of Ordaining, *You* will have slept with your Fathers, and your Bones be resting in Peace amongst Others of God's *Sheep*, for doubtless you would not be in Peace if a *Goat* was to lie near *You*. Now Sir that I may not forget my Obligations to the Man who converted me from the erroneous Tenets of Episcopacy to the more Evangelic Doctrine of Presbytery, I shall impress the Recollection of *You* on my Mind by changing the *vulgar* (and in some Measure *obscene*) Appellation of *Smock-Frock* into that of the *Bensonian Robe*; and therefore, whenever I have Occasion to use it, shall always say to my Servant, *John! I am going to ORDAIN me a Curate this Morning; I wish you would bring me down the BENSONIAN ROBE*. Thus, Sir, I shall manifest my Veneration for the Man who taught me to overcome the Prejudice of Education, and to look upon *Lawn Sleeves* as being no more according to Scripture, Reason, or Common Sense than this *plain Robe*. I hope, Sir, you will approve of my Scheme as you see I wish to perpetuate your Name in the Church of Elders.—However as I am not yet converted to your Opinion, nor do I believe *this* "Tradition of the
"Elders,"

"Elders," you must *permit* me, Sir; to enquire whether it is not authorised by Scripture for a *Bishop* to wear the *ornamental* Dress of Lawn Sleeves; and if it is, then, of Course it must be by Reason and Common Sense. Upon looking into the 28th Chapter of Exodus, and the 8th of Leviticus, I find it said that the *Lord commanded Moses* to make Holy Garments for his Brother Aaron for Glory and for *Beauty*; and amongst several there enumerated a *Robe* is one, so that I perceive it must be of *more* Consequence than You have asserted it to be: for what the *Lord* hath *ordained* cannot be judged of *no* Consequence, since that would be "to contradict himself," (P. 65.) Certainly the Lord would not have given a Command respecting the Dress, if he did not deem this "ceremonial Part of the Business" (P. 67.) of *some* Use: and therefore it was that "He beautified Aaron" with comely Ornaments, and clothed him with rich Garments; with Breeches,* with a long Robe, and with the "Ephod." Ecclesius. xxv. 7, 8. So much, Sir, respecting the Dress of the Person who ordains.—Page 64, You say thus, "St. Paul, in giving Directions to Timothy, *expressly* prohibits him from *ordaining* a Striker." Now, Sir, having carefully looked over the Epistle, I find no such *express* Prohibition as you have so *positively* asserted to be *there*. It is said that a *Bishop* must be no Striker, that is to say an *Elder*, or a Man 50 Years old (as before said), by which Time the Impulse of Youth *ought* to have subsided; at least he ought to have learnt sufficient Self-Government so as to "be angry and yet sin not," Ephes. iv. 26. or, in other Words, he should so curb his Resentment as not to *knock* a Man *down*, even if any ill-manner'd Fellow should give him *the Lie*.—Now if I was disposed to cavil with You on such unfair Grounds as you

* See Note.

have with me, I might say that Young *Ministers* were not prohibited from being Strikers: but I will be candid enough to suppose that if the Command embraces the Highest, it *virtually* includes the lowest of Church Officers.

But I do not find any *express* Prohibition to their *being* ordained who may be called *Strikers*, or young Men of that generous Temper which will not brook a gross Insult, with-
endeavouring "to chastise such Insolence." St. Paul's Words, Sir, do not allude to a Man *about* to enter upon an Office, but to One who has actually attained *to* it. He says "A *Bishop* must be no *Striker*."—1. Tim. iii. 3.

Do you require any further Demonstration of your Error. If you do, have Recourse to your Bible. There read, mark, learn, and *inwardly digest*.

I now proceed to enquire if a Charge which you insinuate *sneeringly* against me, may not be with greater Justice applied to Yourself. You will not allow me to be any Scriptural Convert *at all*, at least you "*strongly suspect*"* (P. 65) that I am not so; but you think that I answer the Character which St. Paul gives of a young Convert, i. e. being "*puffed up with a Notion of his own great Abilities*;" However you *have* sufficient Candour to acknowledge that my "*Friends and Neighbours know me better than you do*." (P. 65.) I suppose they do, Sir! and if you will be at the Trouble of an Enquiry they will all readily testify that I am *no Saint*; that is to say, a Man not without *many Infirmities*, for otherwise I should be a Proof against the Truth of St. James's Assertion, where he says "*In many Things we all offend*." Ch. iii. 2. Now, Sir, give me leave to tell you, that the most malevolent and ill-disposed of all who know me, would

* Quere, Sir. Is strong *Suspicion* consistent with that Charity which thinketh no Evil?

not have *dared* to utter (for Christian Charity, or Regard to Truth, and also to their *own* Reputation, would have restrained them from uttering) such foul Slanders and Detractions of my Character as *You* (a Teacher of the GOSPEL), have done in almost *every* Page of your Letters. Doubtless you intended them to prove to me as *Daggers* piercing my Vitals, or as spiked Instruments "harrowing my Soul:" but they are not sharp enough! They are made of bad Metal, and they lose both their Edge and Point!—But now, Sir, to the Point.—

In the 8th Chapter of 1st Epistle to Corinthians Verse 1. we are told that "*Knowledge puffeth up*, but Charity edifieth." I need not tell *you* that the Apostle here means *human* Knowledge of vain Philosophy, which he has placed in Opposition to Charity, or the Knowledge of Grace. Now, Sir, the first Sort of Knowledge *you* have. You are a *Linguist*, *Logician*, &c. &c. In P. 25. 1st. Defence, you tell us that You have applied "to the Study of *Human* as well as *Divine* Learning." Quere, Then are not *You* *puffed up*? Is there no Pride lurking within You on this Account? Is there no secret Exultation, nor *fancied* Superiority, that makes you act contemptuously towards those of less Learning who *dare* to oppose your Sentiments by a Detection of your Errors? Elated with such your Advantages have you not often applied to yourself (what the good Man only has a Right to apply)—that Promise of God where he says, "They that War against Thee shall be as *nothing*; they that *strive* with (*against*) Thee shall perish?" Isaiah xli. 11. I guess, Sir, that you will return an equivocal Answer to such Questions, and tell me that it is a Maxim of our Laws, *Nemo tenetur seipsum accusare*; No Man shall be compelled to convict himself. Well, Sir! then I'll do it for you. "Out of thy own Mouth will I judge Thee." Luke xix. 22. The Apostle not only told the Corinthians that Charity edifieth, but that it suffereth long,

and is kind; is not puffed up; is not *easily* provoked; thinketh no Evil, &c. 1. Cor. xiii. 4.—In P. 54. 1st. Defence, you say thus, “These, Sir, are the Fruits of the Spirit of God, “and if these Fruits are to be considered as an infallible Test “of the *Integrity* of a Teacher of Religion, *which I do not “deny, sure I am*, many that sustain that Character must “stand convicted of *Hypocrisy*.” Beware! Sir! of what you said; and recollect that Passage in the Book of Job, “His own Counsel shall cast him down; He is cast into a “Net by his own Feet, and he walketh upon a Snare.” Job xviii. 8. I think it will not be long before I prove, *according to this Test*, that You are an *Hypocrite*; or, in other Words, that You do not, in *Practice*, conform to these several Branches of Charity.—That You do not *suffer long*, I shall make appear in the 3d Statement under the Class of *Inconsistencies*, thereby proving that you are *easily provoked*, and consequently proving that you are not *qualified to be a Bishop*, for St. Paul says that a Bishop (which you say means an *Elder*) “must not be soon angry,” Titus i. 7. so that you are *as far from being qualified*, owing to the *Wasphishness* of your Temper, as I am, owing to the Impetuosity of mine, as a *Striker*. That you are not *kind* every Page of your Letters have given me pretty evident Proofs. That you are “*puffed up*” I shall make manifest under the Class of *Pride*; and not a Doubt remains in my Mind that it is owing to your *Knowledge*, or your *fancied* attainments in *human Literature*. *Divine Knowledge* would have edified You, so as to make you more *humble* than you are, not to think of Yourself more highly than you ought to think, but to esteem others, at least *as well as*, if not better than, Yourself. That you *think no Evil*; *no Man* in his right Senses who shall read your first or last “Defence” *can believe*. Nay! You not only *think Evil*, but You *speak Evil*; and this on no better Authority, in *many Instances*, than strong *Suspicion*. Now the Man who reviles his Adversary

fary with wanting Common Sense (P. 70); with being no Scriptural Convert (P. 65); sadly defective in Piety and Knowledge (P. 64), &c. *certainly must not* be charged with being of a *ensorious* Spirit, but that He possesses that Charity which is *kind*, and *α λογίζεσθαι κακόν thinketh no Evil*. I think Mr. B. that neither Reason, nor Religion, has authorized you to "throw out such Insinuations" (P. 75) as you have against *me*: but we too frequently condemn that in others which we practise ourselves. You quite forgot in your Farther Defence that which you promised in P. 19 of First Defence, though you did *not* keep your Promise *there*, viz. "I shall not recriminate, much less shall I return *Railing* for *Railing*." Perhaps, Sir, your Ideas on this Subject may have been formed from the Manners of *Billinggate* Fish-Women, or *Kingswood* Colliers, and if so you have not violated your Promise, for you certainly have not *damned* the Doctor's nor my *Limbs*, nor *blasted* our *Eyes*, but you have said as much as you can to *blast* our Reputations. Now, Sir, in my *weak* Judgment, the Man who is a Reviler and Slanderer is *as far* from the *true* Spirit of Christianity, as he who is a Reveller and *Drunkard*. Nay! he is the *farther* of the Two; for the Crime of the one may, *in some Degree*, be palliated by the Propensities of his Animal Nature, but in the other Case it can only be ascribed to the Depravity and Baseness of his Heart. Now, Mr. B. I call *you* a Slanderer (and in so doing I must *unavoidably* call you *Fool*, for "he that uttereth a Slander is a Fool." Prov. x. 18.) and therefore when I shall in future read the Litany, or hear it *redde*, when I come to that Sentence of it where we beseech God to forgive *Slanderers* and to turn their Hearts, I shall *mentally* implore God to turn *Yours*, as *knowing* you to lie under that *Guilt*.

In your 65th. P. you have told me that "God never moves any Man to take upon him this Sacred Office (meaning the Pastoral) that is not *qualified* for it." The Question

tion I have to ask You, is, if you think a *Slanderer* is qualified to be a Pastor; If you reply in the Negative, the Result will be this,

A Slanderer is disqualified to be a Pastor .

God never moves any Person that is disqualified

Mr. Benson is a Slanderer

Ergo, God never moved Mr. Benson, to this Office.

P. 72. " I have always thought that it was lawful for " any one, that, through the divine Blessing, might be able " to accomplish it, to turn another from the Error of his " Ways; even as every one that is able, is at Liberty to preserve " Life or rescue Persons from drowning."

He who *knows* a Person to be ill of a Disease, for the Cure of which he is in Possession of a *certain* or *probable* Remedy, certainly has a right to administer it upon the Principle of "*doing good*." But, Sir, every Man has *not* a right to take upon him the Medical Profession, in a *general* Way, without being duly called to it. Bold and assuming Empirics will indeed step forth, and trusting to the *Credulity* of Mankind, will profess that they are the *Seventh Sons of Seventh Sons*, and can cure more Diseases than the *regular Doctors know the Names of*; and there are always in the World some weak People who believe these *Professions* and apply to them for Help: but in the End they are *tricked* out of their Property, for a little (of *Dr. Last's* Remedy) *Whiting* and *Water*, or else some powdered Refin and Jalap, and a Packet of Corn-Salve. And we know that there are *Quacks* in Divinity as well as in Physic; or, in other Words, Men who *pretend* to a great deal more Piety than they *really* possess.— But let us now consider the former Part of this Sentence of yours in a moral and religious Point of View. The Sense of the Words, detached as they are from their *Context*, certainly is unobjectionable. Nay it is not only lawful for, but the express Duty of, every *Christian*, who sees a Fellow-Creature

ture in Error, to endeavour to convince him *of* it, and convert him *from* it. But, Sir, there is a very material Difference betwixt the Lawfulness of this Act in particular Cases between Christian and Christian, and the *general* Sense in which *You* apply the Words, as justifying every Man who should assume the *Pastoral* Office. It is *not* lawful, Sir, for every Man to hold forth *Calls* of *Conversion* to Sinners *in general*. He must be *duly authorized* to take upon him that Office, or else, (however pious his Intentions, however virtuous his Conduct, and however powerful his Abilities may be) he will fall into the Sin of *Dathan* and *Abiram*, who thought it but a small Thing to minister unto the Congregation, and therefore they sought the *Priesthood* also. Numb. xvi. 9. This Doctrine that every Man has *not* a Right to burn Incense before the Lord, or to take upon him the Priest's Office is further confirmed in the Case of King *Uzziab*. 11. Chron. xxvi. 18. However this is *one* Crime that you Methodistic Teachers are guilty of. You are not *content* merely to turn such Sinners unto Righteousness as actually come within your Knowledge; but like *Korah* and his Companions, imagining that you are all *holy* Men, ye seek the *Priesthood*; or in other Words, ye must be *Ministers of the Gospel*, forsooth! Nothing less will satisfy your Pride! You imagine the Priests, or Ministers of the Church, take too much upon *them*, and lift themselves up *above* the Congregation, and yet You yourselves fall into *that* which you condemn in others, for by being *Teachers* of the Rest you are necessarily *lifted up* above them.—The whole that I shall say further to refute your Opinion, will be to quote a few Lines from the Εἰκὼν Βασιλική "as to Ecclesiastic Order and the "outward Polity of the Church, I think Confusion in Religion will as certainly follow every Man turning *Priest* "or *Preacher*, as it will in a State where every one affects to "rule as *King*." Ch. xxiv.

Now

Now it matters not by whom this little Book was written, whether by *King Charles* himself, or by either or any of his *Chaplains*. The Reasoning in it is admirable ; the Style smooth and perspicuous. If you have never read it, I wish, Sir, that you would. It may be of some Service towards subduing that *proud Spirit* of Yours which will not submit to the Controul of Superiors, and therefore makes you a zealous Stickler for the Doctrine of Presbyterian *Equality*. The 17th. Chapter which treats of *Episcopacy* may teach You, *that* of which perhaps you are either yet ignorant, or else averse to from some Motives less pure than they *ought* to be.

P. 88, You say that You are not without Hopes of seeing my "Name upon the List of Methodist *itinerant* Preachers by and by."—I rather think, Sir, your Hopes will be delusive in this Respect. That my Name may be upon the List with those who are *denominated* Methodists by such as "lie in Wickedness," is an Honour that I sincerely *pray* to God to enable me to obtain ; but that it will ever be, in *this* World, enrolled amongst those who are Itinerant Preachers of the Gospel upon *Mr. Wesley's* Plan, is what I have not the slightest Conception of at present, and rather than such *strong Delusion* should come upon me, I hope my "right Hand may forget her Cunning," and "my Tongue cleave to *the Roof of my Mouth*," Pl. cxxxvii. 5. Though indeed that would be no great Disqualification for me (according to a Position laid down in P. 29. 1st. Def.) for after having argued the Necessity of *Purity* and *Love* being found in every Teacher of the Gospel, and declared that such a Man is sufficiently qualified for his Embassy, although he understand no Language but that which is common to him and those who learn of him, You say thus "Nay, if he were not to utter *one Word*, there is a Language in his Actions, in his Spirit and Conduct, in his Temperance and Chastity, &c. which *has* a much more powerful and lasting Influence than ten
"I beseech

"*Thousand* Critical and learned Lectures." Now, Sir, at all Hazards, I, a Curate, will venture to declare that the Clergy of the Establishment, (profane and faithless as *You* say they are) shall meet you on these Grounds, and contend which can gain the most "Profelytes from Sin to Righteousness and from Belial to Christ." (P. 87) Do you select any Number you please of the most sanctified Men in the Assembly of Wesleyan Saints, and we (instead of taking Advantage of the Terms of your Position by requiring *ten Thousand* to one) will oppose an *equal* Number of learned *Lecturers* from our Church against your *Orator-Mums*; for you must remember, Sir, that they are not to speak "*one Word*;" whereas, Sir, our *Lecturers* shall have the Privilege of speaking as long as they please; they shall even continue their Speech until Midnight, if they may think proper, till some of their Hearers like *Eutychus*, are fallen into a deep Sleep;—and thus let us see which shall prevail, the Methodistic Saints, or the learned *Lecturers*. I beg Leave to hint to You, Sir, that, because I have proposed this Kind of Competition, *from your own Words*, you must not suppose the Ministers of the Church are at all afraid to meet the most Eloquent of your Society upon equal Terms of *Oratory*; but only I thought it might tend much to the Edification of Mankind, if some of these *Temperate* and *Chaste* Saints were to be stuck up in Pulpits and *say nothing*:—But *Mum* for that. Before I conclude this Subject I must request the Favour of you to tell the World, *from what* Source you learnt that the Gospel was propagated by Means of this *Mummish* Oratory; for in the next Sentence you tell us "It was *thus*, Sir, that Jesus Christ " and his Apostles taught Christianity." But, to prove how strictly *consistent* you are in every Thing you say, before you had finished the very *next following* Sentence, you inform Us that "they made known God's Truth to Mankind in *Terms* " of obvious Signification." Such are the "*irrefragable*"

Kind of Arguments, which Mr. Benson brings out of his Treasury against his two Adversaries, a Doctor of Divinity and a Curate: the former of whom has a bad Heart, as he says (P. 30. 1st. Defence) and the latter a weak head.

I had been obliged to you, Sir, for this Exception in my Favour, if you had not represented my Heart also as not a very good one, for I would rather be thought a *Fool* than a *Knave*. You could not impeach the *Doctor's* Head, because his Writings would instantly have confuted such an Accusation, therefore you attacked him where *you thought* him to be most vulnerable. My poor Head was most assaulted (P. 11) because you either thought me so weak that I could not, or should be so alarmed at your terrific Scourges that I would not, ever *dare* to reply to your Calumnies. "I presume, Sir, it was your Persuasion of this which inspired "you with" (P. 58) sufficient Malevolence to scandalize my Character in the unchristian-like Manner that you have. However though my Reputation may suffer by your Slanders, yet will I rejoice, *because it will serve as a Specimen for Mankind to judge of Methodist Piety and Meekness of Temper.*

By the bye, as I have taken the Liberty of introducing the Doctor's Name, give me Leave, Sir, to ask You a Question relative to him; which may very properly be stated here, though I might Class it under the general Head of *Inconsistencies*, which you will see a few Pages on.—

In P. 43. 1st. Defence, are these Words, "I mention "these things, Sir, with *one only* View, that, if possible, your "Eyes may be opened to see the *Greatness of your Guilt, &c.*" —[The greatness of this Guilt was because the Doctor had endeavoured to "raise the public Odium" against all such *Self-ordained* Teachers as the Methodists.] Now to me there appears a manifest *Untruth* (please to observe, Sir, I do not give you the *Lie*, but I say a manifest *Untruth*) upon the

Face

Face of this Assertion: for if you had *no other* view in mentioning those Things than to *convince the Doctor* of his Error, why not endeavour to do it in the Spirit of Meekness, and, consequently, instead of putting your Intelligence into *Print*, have stated it in a *private* Epistle? I should think *that* Plan would have been more likely to convince him than such a Method as you adopted, which would probably provoke him to Wrath, *if he is as you say*, for you ought to have considered that a Man of a *bad Heart* is not very likely to curb his Anger. The Inference from these Observations respecting *your* Credibility I leave to the Public.

P. 93. "Being reviled we bless, being defamed we intreat," &c. If we are to estimate the whole of this pious People by the Conduct of one of the Leaders of them, then it seems from Mr. B—ns "farther Defence" that Methodistic Blessing is *this*.—If a Pamphlet appears against them containing (what mine is said to contain) a "Mixture of Scurrility and Abuse," (P. 93) the Manner in which they *intreat* the Defamer, and the *Blessing* they return, is to publish an Answer to it, containing Language ten Times more scurrilous and abusive. This is that "Spirit of Christian Love in which they consider and reply." (P. 5) I suppose, Sir, that many of those small Tracts of low Price, which you tell us (in P. 40) that You "print and disperse" among the People, are on Subjects of *this* Kind. This, perhaps, is the "doctrinal, experimental, and practical Christianity" of the Methodists.—

So much, Sir, for Methodistic Patience!

There is one Circumstance which I overlooked in the regular Order of Reply, but which I shall introduce here.

P. 59. you say that "the 2d. and 6th. Pages of my Pamphlet give Us no very favorable Ideas of your Gravity and Meekness of Wisdom." [The second Page certainly does contain what I *ought to be* and *am* ashamed of,—the

knock-down Argument when the Lie is given. The 6th. alludes to the "spruce Head of a modern young Cleric."

It seems that these Words "degrade me in the Eyes of "my Readers" (P. 9.) and give them no very favorable Idea of my Gravity. I hope that those Readers who think thus of me on this Account are chiefly Methodists, and if so *their* unfavorable Opinion will not make me unhappy for an Hour. *Their* good Opinion is not worth being regarded, *who* can deem an innocent Joke sufficient Cause to *degrade* a Man. But, hear this ye Wits! Ye Men of Mirth "who are wont "to set the Table in a Roar!" Hear what the profound Benson declares! that to be Christians ye must be *grave* not uttering a *Word* of Levity. Though all sensible and good Men agree to the Apostle's Remark, that "Foolish Talking, and filthy (or obscene) Jestings are not CONVENIENT," yet an Observation that is lively and cheerful is enough to degrade you with *the Saints*: nay perhaps to exclude you from *Heaven*! No *Wits* are to be found there! Granted, if none but Methodists go there. But remember for your Comfort, ye Wits! and pleasant Companions! that *Cheerfulness*, *Gratitude*, and *Contentment*, are more acceptable Ways of serving the Deity, than Melancholy, *Censoriousness*, and being troublesome to others, and wretched in Yourselfes, by being *righteous over-much*.

Be advised then, by a Curate of the *Church*! Resist the Devil; flee youthful Lusts! look for Help from God to strengthen your Weakness; Be *pious* and under that Term be cheerful and happy: nor dread the Anathemas which may be thundered against you from *grave* Methodist Teachers for being *cheerful* Followers of that Doctrine taught in your Churches.

Thus

Thus, Sir, I have severally replied to all such *Doctrinal* Points as appeared to me necessary to be attended to.—I now proceed to attack You in a more *personal* and particular Manner, under *general* Heads; and prove to my Readers that You are Proud, Positive, Inconsistent, and *far from* being an accurate Grammarian.

A FEW SPECIMENS OF

MR. BENSON'S PRIDE.

P. 15. But to PERMIT you to proceed, &c.

P. 23. But to LET you proceed, &c.

The Tenor of these Words is so plain, that they need no Comment.

P. 71. "I WILL SUFFER you to explain yourself a little "further," &c. These Words convey to me the Idea as if you had said thus, "I the GREAT* Joseph Benson, a chief "Teacher of the Methodists, will *suffer* you, a Curate of "the Church of England, to explain yourself." I have very little doubt, Sir, of its being this Pride of your Heart, which induced you to say that you expected I should meet with a *severe* Reprimand at the *Visitation*. Perhaps you thought that, (as soon as my Name was called over, and I had respectfully answered *Here! my Lord!*) his Lordship would get up, and rebuke me in some *such* Terms as these

* See Note.

Mr. RUSSEL !

Several of my Reverend Brethren here concur with me in Sentiment that you deserve *much* Reprehension for your very forward and imprudent Conduct in writing Hints to the Methodists, &c. A Publication, Sir! which, while it serves as an indelible Stain upon your own Literary Character, clearly proving you to be "a young Man" of little Reading and of little Knowledge" (P. 13), has brought the Church itself into *no small* Disgrace, for by Means of your *Rashness*, the Pen of the *great* and *erudite* Mr. Benson has been provoked to write his "Farther Defence;" a Pamphlet, Sir, containing such severe Truths and such *unanswerable* Demonstrations, that it may be compared to the Disputations of Stephen in the Synagogue, for we are "not able" to resist the Wisdom and Spirit by which" he writes.—Acts vi. 10.

So much, Sir, for Methodistic Humility, or that Charity of yours which is *not at all* "puffed up."

Mr. BENSON'S POSITIVENESS.

P. 61. "You speak this *entirely* of your own Head." Here, Sir, I am under the Necessity of returning the Compliment back, *with more Truth* in the Application of it, saying that You speak *entirely* of *your own* Head for asserting such a thing; for I deduced such Declarations about Timothy and Titus being BISHOPS, &c. from Scott, Churchman, *Elton Bavin*, Dr. Parker's Government of the Church for the first 600 Years; and some others who have written on the *Primitive Discipline* of the Church; all of whom concur in Opinion that Timothy was the *Summus Sacerdos* over the *Sacerdotes* at Ephesus, and the same of Titus, in the Isle of Crete.

P. 63.

P. 63. "Timothy and Titus were rather *Evangelists* than Bishops, an Order in that Age which you overlook."— Such is the modest and cautious Manner in which you state your Sentiments! Dr. Parker speaking of one *Salmasius*, said, that "He was ever most confident when most in the Wrong." I think this may be applied justly against You. How do you know I overlook such an Order? Was it possible that in a small Pamphlet I could advert to every Thing mentioned from Genesis to Revelations? You might just as well have said that I overlooked the Circumstance of *Noah* having drank of the Juice of the Vine till he was intoxicated, because I did not mention it when alluding to the "*reeling Bacchanalians*."—

P. 78. After having charged me (*falsely*) with wishing for the Privilege of *disgracing* my Profession by an *ungodly and wicked* Life, you say thus, "And, no Wonder, for by your *own Confession*, you have your Orders from Rome." Till you can prove that I said *any such Thing* (which I think you never can) I shall consider you as one of those "*Fellows of the baser Sort*" Acts xvii. 5. who will not scruple to say any thing in Order to gain his End: therefore, Sir, I shall here revoke my Wish (P. 3. Hints) that I might "*partake of your Likeness*" (P. 88.) both in Learning and Piety. I am well assured your *Learning* is not as great as it hath been represented to me. Should I attain to your Age I hope my Claim to the Title of a *learned* Man will be much better founded than Yours. And as to your *Piety* I think it "*but a Name*;" (P. 60) a Mask to conceal You: an Endowment which you can *put off and on at Pleasure*." (P. 79) You have certainly *put it off very frequently* in your *Farther Defence*, and sometimes also in the *First*.

P. 85. Having introduced *Mr. Fletcher's* Name and quoted a few Lines which I wrote in his Praise, you say thus, "All this is true, Sir, and abundantly more than probably you ever heard concerning him, or would believe if related by
"ever

"ever such credible Witnesses." — Surely, Mr. B. you must be a Conjuror! and if so, perhaps we shall know something by and by respecting the *Records of Hell!* You have not only learnt the Art of judging of Principles from the outward Actions, but you can enter into the most private Recesses of the Soul, and even tell what a Man will *believe*. I suppose you have some little Archæus that can readily find his Way through the *Meanders* of the Brain till he comes to the *Pineal Gland* (where the Soul is supposed to lodge), and then having learnt a Knowledge of all that is going on there, he returns and tells You every Thing he has seen; or, otherwise, *how is it possible* for you to know what I would believe better than I myself do know? I cannot say what I would believe, or *not* believe, in this, or any other, Instance: unless it be, to believe that You are not the Man you are *said* to be.

Another Proof of your Peremptoriness, and Disregard to Truth, may be met with in P. 87. thus, "And as you have read, *You say*, the Portrait of St. Paul." Sir! I never said so. Be pleased to refer to the last Note in the *Hints*, and you will find in a *Parenthesis*, that I said (*as I am informed.*) At that Time I had never seen the Portrait; and I *guess* that you have not read it *yet*, or else you would immediately have discovered, *by the Statement in that Note*, that I had never seen it, and would probably have given me some severe Censures for saying what I *there* did say. I spake it from the Information of a Gentleman who related many Things to me concerning the amiable Fletcher: a Man of whom I had no *personal* Knowledge, but had read with Pleasure some of his Writings. When I placed Mr. F. in Opposition to Mr. Wesley, I did it from the general Knowledge of his Character, which I had learnt from Oral Testimonies, all of which concurred in declaring him *to be* and *to have been*, a *truly Christian* Pastor. His Portrait I have read within the last three Months, with much Information and many Chastisements

tisements for my own Defects, as "reproaching me for my "*Indolence* in the Sacred Work of saving Souls." (P. 80.)

There are some few Points which I think are carried rather too far. At the same Time that I admire the Portrait in the *general*; there are some Traits in Mr. F's *own* Character that I never mean to imitate, for they certainly are not *enjoined* in Holy Writ, and are inconsistent with the *proper* Discharge of our Duties in this Life: for instance, If one Friend comes to visit another, it does not seem to me necessary that the Visitee should, immediately upon the Visiter coming into his House, go down upon his Knees and pray to God for the Effusion of his Spirit, &c.† I should think it quite enough to give him a hearty Welcome with *I am glad to see you*, &c, &c, according to the customary Modes of Persons *well-bred*; and I am almost certain that 99 out of an 100 will agree with me in *this* Respect, however widely we may differ in others.

Such Instances of *Excess* of Piety as occur in Mr. Fletcher's Life may serve to convince Us that the *Best* have their Imperfections; and wherever we find them in Mr. F. they may be denominated the Infirmities of an amiable good Man. Mr. F. (I believe) was an Israelite indeed! a Man in whom there was *no Guile*. Of Mr. Wesley I cannot judge so favourably. His Ambition, his Thirst for Precedence, gives just Cause to doubt the *real* Humility of his Heart. This Opinion I adhere to notwithstanding Mr. F. having declared him to be one of the greatest Ministers *he* ever knew. His *very ardent* Zeal may, in some Instances, bias his Judgment and Will to think and speak favourably of such Persons as *assumed* strong Appearances of Piety. But if Mr. Wesley

† Those who have perused the *Portrait* will know immediately that I allude to a Circumstance mentioned in the 105th Page, Vol. 1.

was that *sincere* Follower of the divine Immanuel which his Friends represent him to have been, I wonder that, in his *infantile* Days, there was no *Simeon* who should declare that "this Child, is set for a Sign that shall be *spoken against*;" Luke ii. 34. for if *Timothy* was worthy of Prophecies respecting him, 1. Tim. i. 18. surely Mr. W. ought to have had *some*: for he was greater than Timothy, who was under Paul the Archbishop of his Day; whereas Mr. W. was under *no one*, but was himself, not merely a Leader in a Party, or a Primate of the Methodists, but *Primate of all* the Methodists. How can it be accounted for that such an eminent Servant of God should have been so little noticed?

The last Instance of your Positiveness which I shall produce, is this: (P. 21. 1st. Def.) After having given such an Account, as you thought proper to give, of the dissolute Manner in which young Men are prepared to take Orders in the Church, you say as follows "Thus prepared, and *too often* under a full Conviction that there is *no Holy Ghost* to be "received, they appear before a Right Reverend Father in "God," &c.

There are two or three other Sentences in this Page containing objectionable Matter, but I shall omit taking Notice of them.—*This* however is so gross an Improbability that I cannot pass it by. Pray, Sir! amongst all the profane Ministers that *have been* and *are* in the Church, did you ever, or do you now, know any one who was *weak* enough to make such a Declaration to *You*, whatever may be his *real* Sentiments? If you do know any such a one, *name him*; and then see whether or not the *coercive Laws* of the Church shall be put in Force against him. If you *do not*, the Assertion has no better Authority than as being written by a Man who has no *very strict* Regard to TRUTH.—Thus, Sir, I think my Readers will be convinced that You are both *Proud* and *Positive*. I now proceed to "unfold your *great skill* in the
Art

Art of Reasoning ;" (P. 71) thereby proving that you will assert a Thing in *one* Page, and contradict it in *another*.

P. 58. My Hints are termed a "*weak* and *juvenile* Production." The latter Epithet is incontestibly true, and the former in some Respect. But Weakness and Juvenility (or Inexperience) are certainly more excusable than Weakness and Senility, for from *Nestors* we look for *Nestorian* Wisdom ; but I think your "Farther Defence" may justly be denominated a *Series of Senile Inconsistencies*.

Perhaps you will wish it had not appeared, but "*Nescit Vox missa reverti.*" (P. 13)

A Word once uttered cannot be recalled ; or, a Book, Copies of which have been sold to Thousands, is not very easily called in again. No, Sir ! Your first and last Defence will serve as lasting Monuments (longer than Methodism itself will last*) not only of the Weakness† of your Cause, but of the Baseness and Malignity of the Heart of its Defender. A Heart so much like the *whited* Sepulchre, *fair* indeed *without*, but *foul within*, that I should be ashamed to own such a one as an Inhabitant of *my* Breast.

I shall now lay before you a few Specimens of your *Inconsistencies*, or such Passages as seem to contradict each other.

P. 11. "I think those that have it in their Power, and "*WISH WELL TO THE CHURCH*, should give you a *Living* "*were* it only for your *kind Intentions*, and the *Encouragement* "*of such as may hereafter engage in the same Service,*" &c.

I return you my Thanks for *THUS* recommending me to the Patronage of the *GREAT*, but I fear, Sir, that *You* have not much Influence with those that *have* it in their

* See Note.

† That Cause, must certainly be a *weak* One, which requires Scurrility and Defamation as one Means of its Support.

Power. Besides you should not afterwards have told them in *positive* Terms, that I ‘ know not yet what Christianity is,” (P. 81.) and that “ I never ought to have been made a Shepherd of Souls, because I want Compassion for and Love to “ them.” (P. 74) Certainly, Sir, this could not be a very likely Means to obtain Preferment for me; for a Patron would not be very wise (but very *weak*, or very *wicked*) who should nominate to a Benefice a Person “ sadly wanting both “ in Piety and Knowledge,” (P. 64) and having no Compassion nor Love for Souls; unless you admit the Opinion which you have expressly intimated that *I* advanced in my Hints, but *never did*, viz. that a Minister who knows not what Christianity is, would not be *in the least* less conducive, to the Salvation of the People in that Parish where he may be fixed, than the most pious and well-informed Pastor. To appoint a Man of this Sort to a Living, in my Opinion, would *not* be *wishing well to the Church*, but doing it one of the greatest Injuries; *as* tending to increase the Methodists and other Sectaries. For if the Shepherd *cares not* for the Sheep, the Flock will be scattered, and they will then become the Prey of *the Beasts of the Field*. Probably, this was the Object you had in view when you *recommended* me. How to *reconcile* these Sayings of Yours I know not, but must leave them to be hereafter explained by your great Ingenuity. “ This, Sir, is one “ of your *many* Inconsistencies.” (P. 75) If the whole were to be mentioned, I must quote something from almost every Page, which would exceed my intended Limits, and therefore I hope you will be satisfied with a few.

P. II. “ Had I not learnt from a Friend just come from “ Worcesterhire, that there certainly *was* (you should have “ said *is*) such a Place as Pershore” &c. It seems, Sir, from hence, that you have a most *accurate* geographical (or topographical) Knowledge of your own Country; but I am not able to account for this *Ignorance*; for in P. 40. (1st. Def.)
you

you tell us that you "have been an *Itinerant Preacher* for upwards of twenty Years; and during that Time have *laboured* in many of the Cities, large Towns, and Villages of "England and Scotland" &c. Now as Worcestershire is one of those Soils, which not only produces fine *Hops*, but, in which the *Planta Methodistica* thrives luxuriantly, (according to your Account P. 42. 1st Def.) it is rather strange to me that you should never have gone to *water* these choice Plants. And if you ever *laboured*, (or even only walked to *inspect* the Plants) in the *Garden of the Lord* at Worcester, I am surprised you should be ignorant of there being *such a Place* as *Pershore*. I wonder, Sir, that you never walked, nor rode, over to view the Plants in the *Pershorian Garden*; for the Distance between the two Gardens is only *Nine Miles*, and that you know is so *little*, that you might easily have "blown the Gospel Trump" (in Imitation of your great Forerunner) before the *Clerical Gardeners* there had "left their downy Pillows." (P. 86) I believe, Sir, that the *Methodistic* Plants in *both* these Gardens, do not thrive so well as they did *formerly*. Perhaps the Gardeners have neglected to *water* them; or they have not dug about the Roots; or they have not learnt their Art; but so *it is*, the Plants in the Vicar's Garden, of *Pershore*, seem to increase more than they do.—Indeed I am in great Expectations, Sir, that this *Planta Methodistica* will undergo a considerable Change before many Years have elapsed, and be then known only by the Name of—the Root of Scarcity.

P. 29. You say, "I fear it will not be easy to find a *suitable Text*." Your Readers need *not* go any farther than P. 30, before they find a Change in your Sentiment, "And *now*, as I understand you better than I did at first, &c. "three or four Passages occur *this Instant* to my Mind." What a capacious Mind yours must be! Two Prophets and an Evangelist running a Race in it, who should first be honoured

noured by the great Benson with the Adoption of his Language ; and it seems that *Ezekiel* out ran *Zachariah* and *St. John* : so that *Ezekiel* is " swifter of Foot " than *St. Peter* also, for *St. John* did once " outrun *Peter*." *John* xx. 4.

Now I could wish to know what Interval of Time elapsed betwixt your writing those two Passages ; for if without any other Pause than the necessary Time of writing between 30 and 40 Lines (connected as those are) then I think it will appear upon the Face of it that the first Assertion is an evident and barefaced Falshood (mind Sir ! I do not say *Lie*) and consequently prove, that you will not scruple to violate Truth, though you profess to be in search of it.—*Much Time could not* have elapsed to enable You by Reflection to understand me better than you did at first, for your 3d letter is dated the 31st. of August. Now my Hints did not come from the Press till the 23d. Were sent to Manchester the 25th. and, I suppose, arrived there the following Day. From *Mr. Harrop's* Shop I may fairly conclude you were supplied with them, consequently you could not have had more than 5 Days wherein to have written 50 Pages.

This Date of your Letter proves to me a few Circumstances, which I must here recite. First of all admitting the Date to be a *true* one, (that by "*Saturday Evening 6 o' Clock Aug. 31, 1793,*" you had finished those three Letters) it will be evident that more than one Half of your " farther Defence " has no just Claim to secure the Public Opinion towards it as the Result of *mature* Deliberation : You could not have revolved it in your Mind *Iterum atque iterum*, again and again, but it may be termed, "*the hasty Composition of a few Days,*" with more Justice than even my Hints would be so named, and *far more justly* than if imputed to this Reply, for I have been exactly one Month in reflecting upon and selecting the Matter of it, and in *arranging* and *transcribing* it : employed about it all that Time, with very little Intermission,
except

except on the Sundays, so that you perceive I have in this Instance adopted the Counſel you gave me (R. 71) from *Horace*, where he adviſes Perſons who write "*verſate diu*" frequently turn the Subject over in your Thoughts.

In the 2d. Place it proves your Pen to be that of "a ready Writer," or otherwiſe you could not have written ſo much in that Time, unleſs you *neglected* the "*daily Preaching*" (P. 40. 1ſt. Def.) of that "*pure and genuine Chriſtianity*," which you ſo frequently allude to as being taught in your Societies, but *not* in our Churches. If ſo, you *do* love *Controverſy* better than Preaching.

In the 3d. Place, if it be *faſely* dated it proves what mean Arts you will make Uſe of in Order to impreſs your People and Readers with an Opinion of your "great Abilities," in being *able* to write ſo much in ſo ſhort a Time.—Thus, Sir, take your Choice. Your Sentiments (at leaſt for the firſt 50 Pages) are *either* written in *Haste*, or *elſe* you have Recourſe to ſuch underhand Means of gaining Applauſe as a *liberal* Mind would diſdain to apply to.

P. 41. "And to keep as cloſe to the Church as poſſible, "and to prove to all Men that we *object to nothing, almoſt*, "reſpecting it, but the Errors and Sins of its corrupt Members," &c. If I was diſpoſed to *play* upon your Words, I ſhould ſay that your *Objections againſt* the Church *amount to nothing almoſt*; however, Sir, I am much at a Loſs to diſcover the leaſt Poſſibility of reconciling this Paſſage with your *Reasoning* (if it may be ſo called) reſpecting the *Equality* of Biſhops and Preſbyters. The Church of this Realm holds to Episcopacy. You not only impugn this Opinion; but in P. 77, throw out ſome *Inſinuations* and diſtant Hopes, that the *Episcopal Branch of Government* in this Country may "prove ſo rotten as to fall off, and yet the Trunk have Virtue enough to emit *ether* and *more ſound Branches*." [Doubtleſs you muſt mean the Preſbytero-Methodiſtico Syſtem.]

Whenever

Whenever the *Episcopal* Branch shall fall off with *Rotteneſs*, depend upon it, Sir, that *the Viſ Vitæ*, or Principles of Life, will be very *languid* in the *Trunk*, and that it will ſoon be cut down (*by the Faction*) and thrown into the Flames—the Flames of Civil Diſcord, Devaſtation, and Ruin: but ſo long as the People ſhall continue to adhere to CHURCH and KING, there is every Probability of “Peace within our Walls, and “*Proſperity* within our Palaces.” Pf. cxxii. 7.

Do, Mr. B. exerciſe your Ingenuity to explain this ſeeming Contradiſtion: for I have always thought *Episcopacy* to be ſomething more than *nothing almoſt*.

P. 49. You ſay thus. “If you are quite of Opinion “that Suits at Law &c. in *Spiritual Courts*, will do more to “reform the World than the Publication of *the Goſpel of the “Grace of God*, and will *yourſelf* ſet us the Example in getting “theſe Laws executed I will not affirm but we may do ſomething by Way of Imitation of You.” So then it ſeems that if you will not be the *fiſt* to do amiſs, ſo as to be deemed “*Public Curſes* and Peſts of Society,” you have no Objection to follow a bad Example. There is another Inconſiſtency alſo in this Avowal, for it implies that you will imitate the Conduct of a Man, whom you have aſſerted to have ſcarcely *common Senſe*. The Gentlemen concerned in the Management of the *Spiritual Courts* ought to return you Thanks for the very favorable Opinion you have declared reſpecting the Manner in which their Buſineſs is conducted, as being more *intricate, tedious, and expenſive* than any other Courts.

P. 48, 1ſt. Def. “The Methodiſts had need to put on “a Sanctity of Character, &c. ſuperior to thoſe of *many Mi- “niſters*, for they put on *None at all*.”

P. 51, 2nd. Def. You ſay that I have given You “Infor- “mation of what you neither *knew* nor *ſuſpected* before.

P. 52, “That the Corruption of the Clergy was ſo “great and *general* as you repreſent I did not imagine.”

P. 50,

P. 50, "Now, Sir, if this be a just Description of the
"Clergy of *your own* Archdeaconry."*

P. 48, "While (as you yourself know, and in your
"Pamphlet confess) the Lives of *Some* of them" (meaning
"the Clergy) are so distant from every Thing sacred."

P. 52, I am charged with "making *no* Exceptions."

P. 54, "According to the Confession You yourself have
"just made, *Many* of the Clergy *cannot* do this Duty." (The
Duty of reproving Drunkards.)

P. 40. The Cause assigned for building your Chapels, is
"partly to assist *those Few* pious and enlightened Clergy that
"faithfully and clearly preach these Doctrines (the Gospel),
"and partly to supply the Lack of Service of the much great-
"er Number who do not."

P. 79. "Especially considering the honourable Testi-
"mony I repeatedly bear to the Knowledge, Piety, and Vir-
"tue of *Many* in different Parts of the Kingdom."

I shall not trouble You, or my Readers, with any Com-
ments on these Passages, but request them to compare the
Words marked in *Italics*, and they will then perceive your *Lo-
gical* Accuracy.

P. 61. You say that "only two Orders of Church Of-
"ficers are admitted to be of Divine Appointment, viz. *Bishops*
"and *Deacons*." Now in P. 67, after having declared that
Ordination is not absolutely requisite to the Appointment of
Preachers (which I cannot deny, without declaring *thereby* the
Primitive Fathers to be wrong in their *Judgment* and *Prac-
tice*, for we know from History that *Origen* preached before

* The Clergy of *Perfbre* Archdeaconry will, in a former Page, have per-
ceived my Wish to exculpate them from Mr. Benson's *malevolent Imputations*,
and infamous Misconstruction of my Words; and *more*, to this Effect will be
said in a Note at the End.

he was ordained) you proceed to tell us that "Stephen
 "and Philip, among divers others who never preached,
 "were appointed to a *temporal* Office, viz. that of *Dea-*
"cons, or Stewards, by Imposition of Hands." Of all your
 Inconsistencies, Sir, this *appears to me* one of the most fla-
 grant, and not a little excites my Surprise that a Man of Mr.
 Benson's acute Penetration (for he can see as far into a Mill-
 stone as another Man) should thus insert a Sentence contain-
 ing apparently a flat Contradiction to what he had before as-
 serted, at no greater retrospective Distance than 6 Pages.

But, to *prove this*, it is fit that the Meaning of the
 Terms made use of, should be clearly ascertained,—By the
 Word *Temporal* I believe is commonly meant *this*, (at least
 our Dictionaries tell us so) "Not Eternal, *not Ecclesiastical*,
 "not Spiritual, but Secular," &c.—Now in P. 61, Deacons
 are said to be *one* of the two Orders of *Church* Officers. In
 P. 67, They are said to be *temporal* Officers, or Officers *not*
Ecclesiastical; but I suppose you meant *temporary*, an Office
 for a Time, and to be relinquished after a Season; as hap-
 pened to several of the primitive Deacons, some being made
 Presbyters, and some Evangelists.* If so, it only proves your
 manifest Ignorance of the Meaning of Words, and conse-
 quently how liable you are to misapply them Yourself, and to
 misrepresent the Words of others. In *this* Case I must use
 your Language to Dr. Tatham, (P. 47) "You neither know
 "the Subject you undertake to write about, nor the Mean-
 "ing of your own Expressions."

P. 69. Having quoted a few Lines from that Passage in
 the *Hints* where I acknowledged *how far* the Methodists had
 been *useful* (for the Insertion of which, I think, no Man of a
liberal Mind will blame me, for you know it is a Proverb,

* See Note.

founded on *Justice*, that we should "*e'en give the Devil his due*) you say thus, "Thank you, Sir. This abundantly outweighs "all you have said against Us."—In P. 93. alluding to the same Passage, your Language runs thus, "You have been "constrained to bear a *feeble* and *scanty* Testimony in this "your mixture of *Scurrility* and Abuse, to the good God has "done by us."—Thus it seems that a feeble and scanty Testimony, if in *favour* of the Methodists, is sufficient to outweigh (*in their Minds*) every Thing that can be said *against* them.

P. 91, "The Methodists, in general, Sir, whatever "they may become *hereafter* in consequence of the *Reproach*, "Insults, and Injuries they receive from some of the Clergy of "the established Church, are not, at present, Dissenters." P. 94, "We are only ashamed that we do and *suffer* so little"—The Inference from these two Places I leave entirely to my Readers. And here I *might* sum up the Article of *Inconsistencies* but there is a Specimen of the Kind in your 1st. Defence so very *glaring* that I must not let it pass without Notice.—P. 42. You tell the Doctor that "the Parish Officers and "Inhabitants in general, would have no Cause to praise you, "were you to effectuate what, blessed be God, will *never* be "in your Power, the Extermination of the Methodists."

In P. 44, we find you speaking thus, "I will put you "into a Method whereby you may *effectually* stop their further Progress, *if not also* gradually effect their Extinction." So then it seems that Mr. Joseph Benson, P. M. M. (Professor of Methodism at Manchester) is able (*by his own Account*,) to teach Dr. Tatham and the rest of the Clergy to effect an *Impossibility*. Why, Sir! You are greater than the great KATTERFELTO and his black Cat. *He* only proposed WONDERS! You teach how to do that which you said was impossible, or "would *never* be in his Power." Besides how *wisely* is this last Sentence of yours expressed! I should pre-

sume, Sir! that *effectually* stopping their *further Progress* would *gradually* effect their *Extinction*; unless they are of the Race of *Immortals*. If so, O! what a Sinner am I, in daring thus to "fight against"—the Jupiter of the Methodists.

If the Publication of the Hints was as you say (P. 12.) "quite soon enough," I hope that the Appearance of the Reply will not be *too late* to convince You of having told the World such Things as you *cannot prove*, and consequently that your Positions rest on no firmer Basis than the *Ipse dixit* of a Man who will not scruple to pervert, misrepresent, misquote, and misapply, whenever he deems it requisite in Order to gain his Point. Having already *proved* You guilty of some gross Incensibilities; exclusively of some *fair Deductions* that you are Sophistical, Proud, Self-righteous, Cenforious, and "*easily provoked*;" I now proceed to fulfil my Promise of laying before the Public an undisguised Specimen of your *repeated* Violations of the Rules of GRAMMAR.



GRAMMATICAL ERRORS AND INACCURACIES.

P. 9. "*Ita te gere ne merito contemni possis.*" Such is the Language of *Piscator*; but Mr. B. not willing that his unlatinized Readers should lose the Sense of it, translates into English as follows, "So conduct thyself that thou *may*" (should have been *mayest*) "not be deservedly despised." A School Boy of *ten* Years old, if he had learnt Latin but *as many* Months, would be ashamed to send up his *Exercise* so vilely translated. Now the Man who could fail to render those few Words into pure English, and send his Book before the Public with such a gross and flagrant Violation of *Grammar Rules*, has *no* right to rebuke his Adversary for *knocking down* "Participles, Adverbs, and Adjectives *in Ranks*, and sinning
" against

"against the *whole* group of Moods and Tenses." (P. 58.)
Wherein Thou judgest another Thou condemnest Thyself, for Thou doest the same Things. Therefore I retort upon You (in your own Words) "You ought at least, Sir, to understand
 "Grammar, or not pretend to become an Author."

If one of your extempore Preachers should break Priscian's Head, it would be a *pardonable* Fault, but for You a *Leader* and *chief Teacher* of the Methodists, "to sit down in
 "your Closet, and compose a Book for the Public Inspection,
 "and make such Massacre of your *native* Language as You
 "do, is indeed *inexcusable*." (P. 57.)

But this, Sir, "is not the only Instance in which you
 "degrade yourself in the Eyes of your Readers." (P. 9.)
 "Depend upon it I shall not let you go thus." (P. 18.) I
 shall present you with a few more Instances of your Disregard
 to the Maxims of Priscian.*

P. 14, You say to me, "This, Sir, is but a small Specimen of the *numberless* Inconsistencies that present themselves in your Letters." You should have said *numerous* Inconsistencies, for in a Pamphlet, like mine, consisting of about 50 Pages, if every Line had contained a Blunder it would not have been beyond the Power of Numbers to calculate *how many*. In my Opinion, Sir, there is a specific and essential Difference betwixt *numerous* and *numberless*.—

P. 17, "No *nor* the Imposition of a Bishop's Hand
 "neither." These were not the Words you made Use of in your 1st. Defence, P. 15. You there said, "Nor the Imposition of a Bishop's Hand added thereto." This Language was faultless; but how the *Nor neither* can be reconciled with Grammatical Accuracy, and be deemed "Speech
 "that cannot be condemned," I leave you, Sir, to explain.

* See Note.

P. 21, "Yes, you must and *will* allow more before I "have done with You." You should have said I must and *shall*.

P. 29. In the Quotation taken from my Hints you say, that "The Impiety of the Lives of their Clergy *do* not in the "least deprive," &c. I said *did* not; though, was I to write it again, I should say *does* not, or would not. I wonder, Sir, that you could overlook, and fail to mention this as *one* of my *numberless* Inconsistencies. A little lower in the same Page the same Blunder occurs, "just as the Negligence of an "Hireling, or the Laziness of a dumb Dog, *do* not in the "least deprive," &c. Now, Sir, as the two Substantives *Negligence* and *Laziness* are separated by your making use of the *disjunctive* Conjunction *or*, each of them is to be considered as having a *separate* Importance in the Sentence, and, of course, requires to be joined with a Verb singular! therefore *do* should have been *does* or *doth*.—This Objection is equally applicable to that Sentence in P. 31, where the Verb *do* follows these Nouns "Ignorance, Impiety, *or* Indolence." The *Repetition* of the Blunder clearly proves it to be the Effect of *Ignorance*, not of Oversight.—Had you chosen the Conjunction copulative *and* instead of the disjunctive *or*, "these Remarks had been spared" (P. 13), and the Sentences would then have stood *grammatically* unimpeachable; I say *grammatically so*, but not in all other Respects, for you have *misquoted* the latter Part of it, and thereby altered the Sense of the Words as they *originally* stood.

P. 68. "Thus with *one* Stroke of your Pen you *un-christian* all the Churches of," &c. This, Sir, is the *first* Time, that I have seen Unchristian used as a *Verb*. Had it been *unchristianize* I should not have objected to your Language, but I think it a very unchristian, or vile and *ungrammatical*, Act in You thus to make a Verb give Place to an Adjective. Perhaps it may be according to the System of
Presbyterian

Presbyterian *Equality*, which would reduce *Bishops* down to *Elders*.

P. 73. "The *reforming* profligate Characters, the *converting* a Sinner," &c. Now in both these Passages you have either forgotten, or else *do not know*, the right Use of Words. Participial Terminations ought not in *all* Cases to have the Regimen of *Verbs*, but when an Article is prefixed to them they follow the Construction of Nouns; and therefore as you have said *the* reforming, *the* converting, &c. you ought immediately to have added the Preposition *of*; or should have omitted the *Article*, in either of which Cases you had not broken *Priscian's* Head. Here, Sir, I send you a Challenge in your own Words, that "I am ready to dispute *this* Point "with you whenever you please."

P. 88. You have quoted from me, and again misquoted my Language, so as to make it grammatically *wrong*. Thus, "Be able to find Words *enough*." Sir, I said, Be able to find Words *enow*; and if, in the Course of those Years that you have spent in Study, you have never yet learnt the Difference between *enow* and enough, you have passed years *enow* with Profit little enough, and therefore I beg you will refer to your Dictionary, and learn it at this Time. Plural Substantives require plural Adjectives; but *Verbum Sapienti sat*, *A Word* to the Wise is *enough*.

P. 91. L. 28 "They do not dissent from the *principle* "Doctrines." Now, Sir, notwithstanding the gross Errors that I have already detected, I will not be of so censorious a Spirit as to suppose you could mistake this Substantive so far as to use it *adjectively*; but will judge this to be a Typographical Error, and that instead of *principle* I should find *principal* if I was to inspect your MSS. even at this Moment. If I should be mistaken in this favorable Estimate, I am under the Necessity of saying that your *Grammatical Principles* are very bad indeed!

To

To the same cause do I ascribe the orthographic Error of "*Scurility*" (P. 93.)—If I had been disposed to cavil with You on such *frivolous* Pretences, or to use such vain Babblings, I *might* have called you to Account for using in P. 46. of your Defence against Dr. Tatham, the Word *supercede* instead of *supercede*, but I naturally concluded it to be an Error of the Printer. In this Manner, Sir you ought to have judged of my Quotation from Romans vi. and not have noticed it as you did in P. 70. There are *several* other *little* Defects in both your 1st. and 2d. *Defence*, which I shall not think worth being brought into View; except these two which follow. In the last Line of P. 45, 1st. Def. you say "Slaying the Lust that war in Men's members." It *should* have been either the *Lusts* that war, or, the Lust that *war*s, but the first had been most proper. The next is an Orthographical (and also grammatical) Defect which occurs in the 3d. Line, 2d. Def. where you say "*by the by.*" Now, Sir, I should be glad to know if this is Your Mode of spelling that Phrase? I rather *think* it is your Way of spelling it, because it occurs in the same Manner, in P. 23. L. 31. and in P. 73, L. 20. The Repetition of it, affords strong Testimony that you think it to be the right Way. If so, you and I differ; and, *by the Bye*, I think you are wrong: and if you are wrong then it will be manifest that you ought to have studied your own Language, before the Greek and Latin Classics had been made so familiar to You, as you tell us they are (P. 26, 1st. Def.): for in spite of all this Erudition you can mistake a Preposition for a Substantive, and (I guess) *Vice versa*.

Your trifling Objection (P. 83) to my Expression "*have lived*" is scarce worth attending to, if it was not to prove on what *frivolous* Occasions you endeavour to depreciate your Adversary. I have always understood that the *Auxiliary Verb* and the *Participle* are admitted to be good Language. It I was to say that *You* have lived to these Years without having attained

attained true Grammatical Knowledge, I should not be far from the Truth, but near unto it, yea present with it. You may, in this Respect, be compared to those silly Women whom St. Paul mentions as "ever learning, and never" the wiser. 11. Tim. iii. 7.

I hope, Sir, that the Examples here brought as into a Focus, or "into *one View*," which I trust are fairly quoted and as fairly commented upon, are sufficient to convince you and my Readers that you are not so strict a Grammarian as to have *any Authority* for calling others to Account for *Defects* of that kind; yet I should not have thought myself justified in requesting the Attention of the Public to such *trifling* Observations if *You* had not (by your malevolent Censures) *provoked* me to do so in *Self-defence*. This will be evident if you will recollect for a Minute that I never attempted in the *Hints* to bring a single Instance of the Sort out of your 1st. Defence. That I *could* have done so the Perusal of these Pages will afford ample Testimony; but I thought *Doctrinal Errors only* deserved to be exposed. At all Events *You* are the first Aggressor in this Instance; and you should not have forgotten the Apostles Advice, (which you have placed in your Title-Page) to "*shun vain Babblings*." Arguments of this kind certainly cannot increase unto more Godliness, but *rather* the Reverse. I had not touched upon such Topics if you had reasoned against me with Christian Kindness.—But I am really become weary of writing, and I fear my Readers will be disgusted with, such unedifying Contentions. Shall therefore very speedily conclude.

I hope, sincerely and fervently do I hope, (and though Man may disbelieve me, God can tell the *Sincerity* of my Heart, when I wish) that the Partition-Wall which hath so long divided, and which now divides Church-Men and Dissenters, may be ere long broken down, that we may see more clearly the Things which be for our Peace; that we shall not have

these vain Wranglings and Disputes, these Bickerings and Contests about *Non-Essentials* and *Trifles*, but shall *mutually* relinquish mere Human Opinions, and remove all Obstacles to our Union: for as we all profess to be of the Flock of Christ, so should we strive to be *one Fold* under one Shepherd, who will lead us forth to the green Pastures of Peace and Godliness, which are *beside* the still Waters of refreshing Love; and then we shall have Peace and Joy in the holy Ghost, and live in Fellowship as Believers *ought* to live, doing all to the Praise and Glory of God, and our redeeming Lord Jesus Christ.

In this *grave* Sermonic Style I was going to conclude, but my Mind seems disposed for a short Visit to Parnassus; for so much dry Argument has caused her to be thirsty, and she wishes to quench it with a Draught at the *Cassalian* Spring.

As she returns perhaps she may *cull* a few of the *infra-montane* Flowers, and present them to You for a Nosegay.— I perceive she is returning at full Gallop upon her Pegasus, with a small Bunch in her Hand, which is much at your Service if you will please to accept of it.—

AS firm in Temper as the knotted Oak

In Root; which, on the Mountain's Brow, hath stood
The Blasts of Ages without Injury,

(Save what is done by Time's destroying Tooth!)

So will I stand against th' *envenom'd* Shafts

Of Calumny and foul Reproach, nor dread

The Fury of the Methodistic Host,

"Though *Thousands* stand against me on the Right,

"And e'en *that Number ten-fold* on the Left."

Nor Thee *great* Benson! Linguist most profound!

(Who *doubtless* fluently can't speak

The *Hebrew* Language and the *Greek*,

"With as much Ease as Pigs can squeak.")

} Hudib.

Thou

Thou *strict* Disciple of fam'd Priscian's Laws !
 Who wield'ft the Sword of Slander, merciless,
 To cut down *Bishops, Heads of Colleges,*
Archdeacons, Rectors, Vicars, Curates, all
 Composing the Ecclesiastic Tribe,
 Save only Presbyters, and Deacons *temporal,*
 Nor Thee, great Benson ! will I ever dread ;
 (Because I know "*Quid valeant Humeri ;*" P. 71.)
 But, that *same Mercy* I to *Thee* have shewn,
 When thou repli'ft do thou extend to *me*.

In Hopes, Sir, that the fragrant Odours exhaling from
 this *fresh-gathered* Posy may be agreeable to your Mental Ol-
 factories, and under every due Impression that Gratitude
 should inspire for *Friendship* like Yours,

I conclude,

YOUR WEAK-HEADED,

UNLEARNED, IMPIOUS,

AND *uncompassionate* OPPONENT,

W. Rufael.

STAFFORD, JUNE 12, 1794.

THESE ARE THE PRINCIPAL REASONS WHY THE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA HAS DECIDED TO
PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE
RURAL INDUSTRIES OF THE COUNTRY.
THESE INDUSTRIES ARE OF GREAT IMPORTANCE
TO THE RURAL COMMUNITY AND TO THE
ECONOMY OF THE COUNTRY AS A WHOLE.
THEY PROVIDE EMPLOYMENT TO THE
RURAL POPULATION AND HELP TO
IMPROVE THEIR STANDARD OF
LIVING. THEY ALSO CONTRIBUTE TO
THE GROWTH OF THE NATIONAL
ECONOMY BY PROVIDING A
STABLE MARKET FOR THE
RURAL PRODUCE AND BY
ENCOURAGING THE EXPORT OF
RURAL INDUSTRIES.

NOTES.

* FROM P. 8.—Those Gentlemen of the University of Oxford Who shall do me the Honour to read these Pages will immediately perceive that this Thought is taken from a well-known *Pun* of the late Dr. Barton respecting some College Gates that were fastened on a Fast-Day : but for the sake of such Non-Collegiates of my Readers as have never yet heard it, the Jest shall have a Place here.

Ab! (said the Doctor on observing them shut) *I find that my Friend—has a Mind to keep the FAST very rigidly indeed!* Why do you think so Dr. ? said the Gentleman who was his Companion at the Time. Why! *So as not only to fast himself, but even to make his GATES FAST.*

Mr. B. let me intreat you not to be severe upon me for the Introduction of this Joke. O! Sir if you have *one Grain* of Mercy in your Composition, let it be shewn to me when you answer this Reply; and do not call my Publication a Theological *Jest* Book, for an Observation so cutting as *that* would make me wretched indeed! *Perhaps*, Sir, it may cut me to the Heart; therefore spare me! spare me! and have Pity on my *Youth!*

* From P. 27.—As several Persons who purchased the Hints did not know what was meant by *Si quis*, it will be right to mention it here, viz. that the Paper which is read in Church previous to a Person's taking Orders, is so named from having those two Words in it when written in the *Latin* Language; which Words signify *If any, &c.* meaning If any Person knows any Objections to the Candidate, &c. Is so named for the Sake of Brevity.

* From P. 43.—As I have here alluded to your *Self-righteous* Spirit, you will permit me, Sir, to say that, I think, it was this *Allusion* in P. 32 of the *Hints*, which induced you to calumniate me in the Manner you have. It came "too close to your own Heart." (P. 80.) You therefore wished to make my *PiCTure* in particular, and those of our Church in general, as ugly as your own and others of the Methodists. As I had there drawn a slight Sketch of the Methodistic Countenance (for as *Lawater* says of Natural Physiognomy, *It is a Science of Truth*, so I believe of *Moral* Physiognomy) and having made Self-Righteousness the most prominent Feature in it, you were disgusted at viewing your own hideous Deformity, and were angry with the Draughtsman; and, therefore, threatened to *kill* him, if he should attempt to sketch you again. But, you see, Sir! how provoking he is; He does not regard your sanguinary Threats

Threats. He even dares to say that You are *still* walking in the same Path of Pharisaical Pride. Thus in your 47th Page you say "We should not hear one Word of this dreadful Charge of Schism, if we did not *most of Us* differ from "the Generality of Mankind." I forbear, Sir, to make *any* Comments on this Passage; the simple Statement of it is *enough*.

* From P. 51.—Those of my Readers who would wish to attain a tolerably correct Knowledge of Church Government, respecting its Officers, Power, and Discipline, *without* the labour of *much reading*, in my Opinion, cannot apply to a Book of more compendious Information than this of Mr. Churchman's.

Whatever he advances, he illustrates by the Opinions of the Primitive Writers, and his own Thoughts are sound and rational. I can only say that I am *principally* indebted to him for that Share of Knowledge which I have attained respecting Ecclesiastical Government.

* From P. 57.—Having thus strenuously adhered to my original Declaration, a little Explanation is become requisite. If my Assertion respecting *Inebriety at Visitations* had been as *positive* and *general* as Mr. Benson has interpreted it to be, and which he so *repeatedly* alludes to with Exultation (by the Bye, a bad Proof of his Christian Love!) then I confess that my Reverend Brethren in *Per-shore* A'deac'ry and *elsewhere* had cause enough to be angry with me in *no small Degree*, for having laid Things to their Charge that most of them were innocent of; but my Words were "and afterwards to eat and drink so much *perhaps* beyond the Bounds of Temperance."—*At the Time* I did not consider that these Words *may be* of Injury to my Cause.—It may be asked, Why did I not? it was evident on the Face of them! Because I concluded that I was arguing with a sincere Christian. I knew my Adversary to be a Man who talked much *about Christ*, and found Fault with others for being sadly defective in the Love of Christ, and so forth; and knowing that Christian Charity, instead of wishing to *misrepresent*, and to aggravate the Malignity of any Actions, would rather strive to hide "a Multitude of Sins," *when the Revealing of them would be productive of more Evil than Good*; I was therefore not *at all* suspicious of malevolent Misconstructions being put upon my Words. I was not at all afraid of speaking *the Truth*. I never said what the evil Spirit of Bensonian Malice hath said for me,—that, they "*reel'd thro' the Streets like a Company of drunken Bacchanals*." (P. 53) I appeal to my Words, and *from thence let me be judged!* not from what Mr. Benson has had the Effrontery to declare in his farther Defence. The *Perhaps* was a Term of Doubt. I could not be rash enough to say it *certainly would* be the Case; but I believe that Facts themselves will *justify* me if I say that whenever a Visitation has been *numerously* attended there have been Some, even of the Clerics, who have exceeded the Bounds of Temperance farther than they ought, though *not* to such Excess as to reel about the Streets. If any of my Fellow
Labourers

Labourers in *Christ's* Vineyard are offended at my Boldness of Speech, I conclude they are those who, *as well as myself*, have been guilty of such a Degree of Excess. This my Rev. Brethren is the Language of my Apology to Ye for what I asserted in my Hints. To as many of ye as are angry with me on this Account for having said so much, I here earnestly beseech you to resolve with me, that from your Hearts you will utter this Language, "*If I have done Iniquity I will do so no more.*" Job xxxiv. 32. And to that more numerous Part of the Clergy who are innocent in this Respect, whatever their Rank, and whatever their Age, I here sincerely say I am sorry that my *Inadvertence* should have subjected them to the *least* Reproach from any Person, particularly to that which has been levelled at them by an invidious, detraactive, and evil-minded Teacher of Methodism.

† From P. 57.—In P. 24, 1st Def. You say thus. "He then that has any other Design in undertaking or executing the Office of a Minister than purely this, to glorify God, and save Souls, his Eye is not single."

Now, Mr. B. though I heartily agree with You that this *should be*, by far the principal Object of a Person who enters the Ministry, yet I cannot admit that a Man's Eye is *evil*, and his whole Body full of *Darkness*, if he should entertain some Hopes of getting a good *Living*; for as it increases his *Means*, it increases his *Power* of doing *Good*; which *might* ultimately tend to the Glory of God.

But what still further convinces me that *such Views* are not so criminal as you represent them to be, is that the Faith of Moses is admitted to be sound, although "he had Respect to the *Recompence* of the *Reward*." Heb. xi, 26. For this Reason, Sir, I think, that, the Principles of a Minister are not to be impeached, *merely* because he has *some* Respect to that *Earthly* *Recompence* of *Reward*—Church-Preferment.

* From P. 62.—Perhaps this Reply may fall into the Hands of some who can more readily find Fault with others, than do better themselves, and they may censure me for my *Vulgarism*, saying I might have expressed myself in better Language than this of—*making a Parson*. Such *Carpers* will be so obliging as to read the subjoined Quotation from the *elegant* Commentaries of Mr. Blackstone. "The Appellation of *Parson* (however it may be depreciated by familiar, clownish, and indiscriminate Use) is the most legal, most beneficial, and most *honourable* Title that a *Parish-Priest* can enjoy."—See Vol. 1. P. 384. 8vo Edition.

* From P. 65.—Perhaps, Sir, you will say I am fond of Notes. I am so, Sir, even if the Idea is extended as far as to Musical Notes or Bank-Notes: and with respect to Notes of this Kind, I think them necessary to introduce such Thoughts as may occur, and cannot properly be wove into the Discourse. Here you see, Sir, that *Aaron* not only wore a long *Robe*, but *Breeches* also. The Apocryphal Writer is authorized to say so from what is mentioned, Exod. xxviii. 42. Now I am rather surprised that you who hold

to the Doctrine of Elders, and consequently malign Episcopacy, do not, in the Spirit of a true *Sans Culotte*, refuse this Cover to your Nakedness, because it was worn by Aaron who was an Episcopalian. This shews clearly that You—the Methodists, and others in this Nation, who adhere to the *Presbyterian* Doctrine, are not as true to your Principles as the *Kirk* of Scotland, for the bold Highlanders, (whom I revere for their Courage) as they are of the *Presbyterian* Persuasion, do, to this Day, refuse to wear this *Natean* Vestment; *probably* to shew their Contempt for Aaron and all his Followers who adhere to Episcopacy.

* From P. 77.—As I have frequently called you the *great* Benson, you shall now know why I did so. I presume that is your Appellation among the Saints; for soon after the Publication of the Hint I received an anonymous—and *infamously* *scurrilous*—Letter; (from a Methodist, I guess, because *Wesley's* Head was upon the Seal) wherein was this Sentence: “Should you fall under the Lash of the *Great Benson* he will make you grin, as he has already the infamous *Tatlam*; who has been ashamed to shew his Face in Oxford, since the Appearance of his *truly valuable* Letters.” The latter Part of the Sentence is an evident Falshood; but this I do not wonder at when I consider the *Unde-derivatur* of it. The first Part is only true in this Respect, that if the great Benson's Lash has produced *any* Grin upon my Countenance, it has been that of—*Contempt*.

* From P. 83.—Here you perceive, Sir, that the Man whom you declare to be “not called of God,” has ventured to prophesy. If he was to say that the Spirit of the Lord was upon him giving him an Insight into Futurity, it may be laughed at by others of his Readers as well as the Methodists, and probably You may retort upon him that he prophesies out of his own Heart as he will have it; that he has seen nothing; that it is a lying Divination, and a Spirit of Delusion. Be as it may, there is a something impresses me at this Moment that tells me the Wesleyan Sectaries will be like other Schismatics that *have had their days* and are now known only amongst the Records of past Ages. The Tenets of the *Ebionites*, the *Corinthians*, the *Marcionites*, the *Novatians*, and other Heresies and *Schisms* in different Ages have been in *Vogue for a Time*, and been adhered to by Thousands in the different Nations and Countries which they overspread, but the whole of them are now so completely extinct that our Books are the only Means of knowing they were ever in Existence.—Such I think will happen to the Methodists in the Course of a Century or two. Perhaps the present Generation will not have passed away without visible Tokens of a *Consumption* that will soon carry off the Wesleyan Sect in spite of all the Prescriptions entered in the *Schismatic Pharmacopeia*, by Doctors Wesley, Benson, and others of the *fanatical* System.—I now fancy that I see the Church about the Conclusion of the 18th Century riding triumphant over all her Enemies like a Ship of the Line that has fallen amongst a *Nest of Pirates* who have attempted to board and plunder her, but her *Canons* have

have beaten them all off and sunk several of them in the Ocean—of Oblivion.—Then will the People no longer be deluded with Fanaticism, nor listen to slanderous Reports of their *lawful* Pastors, but will look up to the *Priests* of the Church as their *Guides* to Eternal Happiness, and they will be nearly one Fold under one Shepherd.

* From P. 90.—Mr. B. when you write next will you be so obliging as to tell me, and the Rest of your Readers, what were the particular Duties of Evangelists? Whether of a separate Order or not? The Reason of this Enquiry, is because I find St. Paul *discharging* Timothy to “do the Work of an *Evangelist*.” 2d. Tim. iv. 5. Now You say, he was only a Presbyter; I say he was a Bishop: but perhaps some *Wisehead* will prove us *both* in the wrong, and from hence say that he was only an *Evangelist*.

But quere, May not either a Bishop or a Presbyter *evangelize*, or preach good Tidings:—Redemption to Man, and Salvation through Christ?

* From P. 93.—The Name of *Priscian* being frequently mentioned in this Controversy, I think it necessary, for the Satisfaction of *Some* of my Readers, just to mention that he lived at Athens in the Time of *Justinian*, (a Roman Emperor) wrote upon *Grammar*; and is said by some to have been a Christian, but afterwards *Apostatiz’d*.

AS a few Thoughts have occurred since the Foregoing was written, I must subjoin them by Way of *Conclusion*.

I have no Doubt but you will obstinately persist to resist the Truth, for you tell us that “the careful Perusal of the Hints did not cause you to alter your Mind in *any one* Instance;” and, (as I said before, P. 21, L. 30.) most probably you will reply to this in a very short Time. Now, Sir, if I should never take Notice of you *any more*, I hope, neither you, nor my Readers, will interpret my Silence as a *tacit* Acknowledgment from me that I believe You unanswerable.

This Reply will prove that you are *not* one of those Writers who advance nothing but incontrovertible Truths. Therefore let my future Silence be ascribed to these Causes.—1st. That “There is no End of making Books,” if Men will pertinaciously resist every Thing that carries Demonstration with it.

2dly.—There are *enow* Books already published to give us Insight into all necessary Knowledge if Men will but look into them.

3dly.—Time may be employed much better than being continually taken up with vain Wranglings; though I have thought it my Duty to oppose you thus far.

And, 4thly. I do not know that the Ministers or People of the established Church have any Fund to *defray the Expence* of publishing their Opinions, in Defence of *her Doctrines*: and Printing is now become a very heavy

Charge upon such as publish their Labours at *all Hazards*, i. e. independent of *Subscriptions*. In this Respect your Societies have great Advantage over us; for, I believe, you have a Fund which enables you to vend your Books at a cheaper Rate than they could otherwise be sold for: and you have also a ready Mode of *circulating* your Publications, for almost every Itinerant Preacher of your Doctrines (if my Information be authentic) applies one Side of his *Saddle-Bags* to the Purpose of a Bookseller's Shop, from whence the *Saints* are supplied with *such* Pamphlets as may tend to confirm them in their Adherence to Methodism. To this Cause it may be chiefly ascribed that your 1st. Defence has seen a 2nd. Edition. They are *almost forced* upon the Saints, being *such* "truly *valuable*" Letters. Perhaps your Remark in P. 71. will prove true, *viz.* that the *Hints* will never see a 2nd. Edition. But I shall be very much deceived in my Expectations if this Reply does not see a 2nd. and a 3d. Edition, for it contains such Truths, as, if generally known, would greatly check "the farther Progress" of Methodism, and consequently *tend* to exterminate the Sect. Having stated these Things, and declared my Intentions not to oppose any more your Fanatical Delusions, but to study to be quiet and mind my own Business, that is to say, the more *immediate* Duties of my Profession; I here bid you farewell! beseeching the Almighty that he would give you a more perfect Knowledge of the *Truth* as it is in Christ Jesus.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

Page 10, Line 14, (Note) for shapen read shaken

14,	4,	for authorisid, read authorized		
17,	18,	practice	practise	
31,	16,	promised	threatened	
37,	22,	Eernal	Eternal	
41,	10,	Job	Joab	
—,	11,	V. 17	V. 19	
54,	13,	Brethen	Brethren	
75,	30,	my	your	
—,	31,	Ideas	Idea	
86,	30,	would	could	
101,	34,	his	is	
13,	25,	Westleyan	Wesleyan	
73,	8,			
104,	28,			
—,	29,	days	day	
—,	30,	Corinthians	Cerinthians	
89,	Note	Archdeaconry	Deanery	
102,	20,			
—,	24,	Why did Inot? Why did you not?		
64,	21,	Insert the before Presbytery.		
96,	16,	immediately after Line insert P. 15.		

Some few other Places are defective, and also in Punctuation, but those are left to be corrected by the Reader.

25452

04.10.1944 10.10.1944 01.10.1944

1947

1. 100. 2. 100. 3. 100. 4. 100. 5. 100.

100 100 100 100

11

En... ..

1948

1911

100

1000

25. 11. 1957. 22. 11. 1957.

1912

1970-1971

1940

100

1940

1892

100

2014-10-10 10:10:10

[Faint handwritten notes at the bottom of the page]

100

18

1990

1990

1990

1950

100-100

1990

1990

100

100

1

1990

1990
